

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07097502 4





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION FOR THE CLERGY
Cum Approbatione Superiorum

Vol. LVII

“ Ut Ecclesia aedificationem accipiat.”

I COR. 14 : 5.



PHILADELPHIA
American Ecclesiastical Review
The Dolphin Press
1917



AY 20 1955

COPYRIGHT, 1917
American Ecclesiastical Review
The Dolphin Press

CONTENTS—VOL. LVII.

JULY.

	PAGE
SAINT PAUL'S MESSAGE ON THE MASS	I
The Rev. H. T. E. Richards, B.A., London, Ontario, Canada.	
THE PASTOR AND HIS SCHOOL SISTERS	12
Sacerdos.	
THE PRIEST IN MEDIEVAL LITERATURE	30
Professor Elbridge Colby, Minneapolis, Minnesota.	
FREEMASONRY, STATE, AND CHURCH	43
The Rev. John M. Cooper, Ph.D., S.T.D., Washington, D. C.	
BENEDICT XV AND THE SEPTENARY OF THE ORDER OF PREACHERS	65
The Rev. Stanislaus M. Hogan, O.P., North Adelaide, Australia.	
ANALECTA:	
SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII:	
Indulgentia Partialis tribuitur Renovantibus Propositum cuius-	
cumque mortis generis suscipiendi	74
SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS:	
I. Translatio Sedis Episcopalis Kearneyensis seu Insulae Gran-	
densis	75
II. De Secreto Servando ab iis qui de Informationibus requiruntur	
circa promovendos ad Episcopatum	76
ROMAN CURIA:	
List of Recent Pontifical Appointments	77
STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:	
Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month	78
The Confession of Deaf Mutes	78
Viaticum to Soldiers in Battle	83
Remarriage after Divorce	83
Altar Boys' Surplices	83
The Litany in Latin on Rogation Days	84
The Stole worn during the Way of the Cross	85
Confessions in Sacristy	85
The Sign of the Cross	85
Burial in Protestant Cemetery	88
Restitution for Insurance Fraud	89
The Tabernacle Veil again	90
Extent of Indult to say Votive Mass on account of Defective Sight...	91
Lace on the Altar	91
Are Priests Easy Victims of Professional Beggars? (<i>N. J. L.</i>)	92
CRITICISMS AND NOTES:	
Lynch: The Story of the Acts of the Apostles	94
Petrovits: Theology of the Cultus of the Sacred Heart	95
—: Fourth Biennial Meeting of the National Conference on Cath-	
olic Charities	96
Sellars: The Next Step in Democracy	97
Henderson: The Order of Nature	100
Boodin: A Realistic Universe	102
—: The Poems of B. I. Durward	104
LITERARY CHAT	108
BOOKS RECEIVED	111

AUGUST.

	PAGE
NATIVE CLERGY FOR MISSION COUNTRIES	113
The Right Rev. Monsignor Joseph Frère, D.C.L., Miss.Ap., New York City.	
THE NEW EDITION OF THE ROMAN RITUAL	129
The Very Rev. Monsignor A. B. Meehan, D.D., J.U.D., Rochester, N. Y.	
THE PRIEST'S TABLE	141
The Rev. Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C., Notre Dame University, Ind.	
FRIARS AND MONKS IN MEDIEVAL LITERATURE	152
Professor Elbridge Colby, University of Minnesota.	
FREEMASONRY AND MODERN LIFE	164
The Rev. John M. Cooper, Ph.D., S.T.D., Washington, D. C.	
ANALECTA:	
ACTA BENEDICTI XV:	
Epistola: Tertiariis Saecularibus S. Francisci datur Facultas Benedictionis seu Absolutionis Recipiendae intra octiduum Festivatum quibus ea est adnexa	185
SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII:	
De Spiritismo	186
SACRA CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS:	
Interpretatio Decreti "Cum de Sacramentalibus"	186
SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA (Sectio de Indulgentiis):	
Vulgantur Documenta quaedam Concessionis Indulgentiarum	187
STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:	
Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month	189
Newman's Argument from Conscience for the Existence of God. (<i>The Rev. John J. Toohey, S.J., Washington, D. C.</i>)	198
A Layman's Reflections on His Pastor's Eloquence. (<i>F.</i>)	192
The Short Form of Extreme Unction. (<i>Constant Reader</i>)	196
The Pope and the Ecumenical Council. (<i>The Rev. Augustine Lehmkuhl, S.J., St. Ignatius College, Valkenburg, Holland</i>)	198
The Nuptial Blessing outside the Nuptial Mass	199
Catholic Physician in Consultation	199
Statues on the Main Altar	200
The Sanctuary Lamp	201
Dancing at Church Picnics	201
Passive Membership in Odd Fellows	202
Color of Antependium at Requiem Mass	202
The Paschal Candle	203
Catafalque "Absente Cadavere"	203
Burial of Protestant in Catholic Cemetery	204
Versicle and Prayer after Litany of Blessed Virgin	204
First Friday Exercises	205
The Three-Branched Candle used on Holy Saturday	205
CRITICISMS AND NOTES:	
Pohle-Preuss: Extreme Unction, Holy Orders and Matrimony	206
Pohle-Preuss: Eschatology, or the Catholic Doctrine of the Last Things.	206
Noll: The Fairest Argument	207
Anweiler: The "Chronica Fratrjs Jordani a Giano"	208
Pallen: A Memorial of Andrew J. Shipman	209
McGill: The Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Kentucky	211
Von Treitschke-Dugdale-De Bille: Politics	212
Ward: The Labor Movement	217
Fillebrown: The Principles of Natural Taxation	218
LITERARY CHAT	219
BOOKS RECEIVED	223

SEPTEMBER.

	PAGE
EDWARD SORIN, C.S.C., AT NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY	225
THE MATTER COVERED BY THE PRIEST'S INTENTION AT MASS	237
The Rev. David Barry, D.D., Limerick, Ireland.	
THE VIRGIN ISLANDS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	247
The Right Rev. Charles Warren Currier, D.D., Bishop of Hetalonia.	
ABBÉ BREUIL AND THE CAVE MEN ARTISTS	257
James J. Walsh, M.D., Ph.D., K.S.G., New York City.	
ANALECTA:	
ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV:	
I. Ad R. P. D. Titum Trocchi, Archiepiscopum Titularem Lacedemoniensem, Delegatum Apostolicum Cubanum et Portoricensem	269
II. Ad R. P. D. Ioannem Cavanaugh, e Congregatione Sanctae Crucis, Moderatorem Studiorum Universitatis a Nostra Domina nuncupatae	270
SACRA RITUUM CONGREGATIO:	
I. De Commemoratione Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum.....	271
II. Dubia de Missis in Commemoratione Omnium Fidelium Defunctorum	272
ROMAN CURIA:	
List of Recent Pontifical Appointments	272
STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:	
Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month	273
The New Codex of Canon Law	273
The Sovereign Pontiff on the Office of Preaching	274
A Critic of Canon Sheehan	274
Theories about the Time the Soul Enters the Body. (<i>The Rev. John T. Murphy, Charlottetown, P.E.I., Canada</i>)	281
The Scarcity of Priests. (<i>Barry Good</i>)	293
How Our Clergy are Recruited. (<i>Clericus</i>)	296
Day Retreats or Missions. (<i>Franciscan Missionary</i>)	300
"In the Minds of Three." (<i>D.-W.</i>)	303
Restitution and Bankruptcy	307
The Reserved Case of Marriage before a Non-Catholic Minister. (<i>Fr. Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M.</i>)	311
"Two-faced" and "Three-faced" Masses	314
The "Orate Fratres"	314
Is He a Heretic or a Catholic?	315
Holy Communion for Invalids Not Fasting	316
Protestation of Innocence by Convicted Murderer before Execution... ..	316
No Delegation Required for Validity of Marriage	317
Precedence of Dean and Vicar-General	318
Consecration of Chalice	319
Priest Assisting at Re-marriage after Divorce	319
CRITICISMS AND NOTES:	
Windle: The Church and Science	321
Delloue-Leahy: Solution of the Great Problem	323
Grisar-Lamond: Luther. Vol. VI	324
Dominican Fathers: The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas. Part II (Second Part)	330
Benson: Sermon Notes	331
Meehan: Thomas Maurice Mulry	332
LITERARY CHAT	332
BOOKS RECEIVED	336

OCTOBER.

	PAGE
THE ROSARY	337
The Very Rev. John T. McNicholas, O.P., S.T.M., Rome, Italy.	
THE NEW CODE OF CANON LAW	357
The Very Rev. Mgr. A. B. Meehan, D.D., J.U.D., Rochester, N. Y.	
SOME CHANGES MADE BY THE NEW CODE OF CANON LAW	371
The Rev. Fr. Stanislaus Weywod, O.F.M., Paterson, N. J.	
REGULATIONS ON PREACHING	377
The Rev. Joseph MacCarthy, B.D., Dunwoodie, N. Y.	
THE PRIEST AS PREACHER AND CATECHIST	390
The Rev. Frederick A. Houck, Toledo, Ohio.	
ANALECTA:	
ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV:	
Litterae Encyclicae de Praedicatione Divini Verbi	399
SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS:	
Normae pro Sacra Praedicatione	410
SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM:	
I. De Sacra Unctione Manus in Ordinatione	417
II. De Instrumentis "Campane Tubolari" in Organo	418
ROMAN CURIA:	
Recent Pontifical Appointments	419
STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:	
Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month	420
The Duty of Pastors toward Our Catholic Soldiers. (<i>The Rev. Alphonsus Martel, O.S.A., Chicago, Illinois</i>)	420
Christian Doctrine at Masses on Sundays. (<i>The Right Rev. Mgr. Victor Day, V.G., Helena, Montana</i>)	423
Interruption of Mass at the Offertory	429
Primary and Secondary Intention at Mass	430
Monthly or Weekly Confession	430
Purification of the Chalice	432
Conditional Absolution of Suicide	432
The Form of Baptism	433
The Congregation at Mass	434
Profession of Faith	435
Feminism	435
Distributing Baptismal Salt	436
Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament by Sisters	437
Gregory XII Successor of Urban VI	437
ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:	
Recent Bible Study: Christological Theories, 25: Ritschlianism, I. (<i>The Rev. Walter Drum, S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland</i>)	439
CRITICISMS AND NOTES:	
Otten: A Manual of the History of Dogmas	440
MacEachen: Moral Series (Catholic Library)	441
Garvin: The Centenary of the Society of Mary	442
——: Life of Mother Pauline von Mallinckrodt	453
Farrell: An Introduction to Political Philosophy	455
Butler: "Blessed art Thou among Women"	455
Kümmel: The Ebb and Flow of Life (Stories)	457
Calkvert: A Year of Costa-Rican Natural History	458
LITERARY CHAT	461
BOOKS RECEIVED	463

NOVEMBER.

	PAGE
THE SERMON, THE CONGREGATION, AND THE PREACHER	465
The Very Rev. William J. Kerby, S.T.L., Ph.D., Washington, D. C.	
THE CORRESPONDENCE OF SAINT AUGUSTINE AND SAINT JEROME—A STUDY.	476
The Rev. Francis E. Tourscher, O.S.A., D.D., Villanova, Pa.	
THE NEW CODEx OF CANON LAW. II. De Rebus	492
The Very Rev. Mgr. A. B. Meehan, D.D., J.U.D., Rochester, N. Y.	
FRANCIS SUAREZ: THE MAN AND HIS HISTORY	512
The Rev. Japheth S. Jollain, S.J., St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.	
FATHER HUGO OBERMAIER. The Time and Place of the Cave Man in World History	523
James J. Walsh, K.C.St.G., M.D., Ph.D., New York City.	
ANALECTA:	
ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV:	
Foederi Missae Quotidianae in Archidioecesi Neo-Eboracensi Indulgentiae et Privilegia in perpetuum conceduntur	535
ACTA OFFICIORUM:	
De Praescriptis aliquorum Codicis Canonum	537
S. CONGREGATIO DE SEMINARIIS ET DE STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIBUS:	
De Novo Iuris Canonici Codice in Scholis proponendo	537
SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA (Sectio de Indulgentiis):	
Dubia Circa Altaria privilegiata et Missas in eis celebrandas	538
ROMAN CURIA:	
List of Recent Pontifical Appointments	539
Division and Erection of Some Dioceses in Australasia	540
STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:	
Our Analecta—Roman Documents for the Month	541
Part of Canon Law Now in Force	541
Newman's Argument from Conscience for the Existence of God	543
I. <i>The Rev. J. C. Harrington, St. Paul, Minnesota</i>	544
II. <i>The Rev. John J. Toohey, S.J., Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.</i>	549
Benediction with the Ciborium	557
Pastor's Absence from His Parish	557
Priest Assisting at Re-marriage after Divorce	558
Canticle "Benedicite" after Mass	559
Formal Object of Devotion to the Sacred Heart	560
The "Acta Apostolicae Sedis"	561
Is this Cemetery Blessed?	561
Repeating Extreme Unction	562
The Significance of Wearing the Scapulars	563
ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:	
Recent Bible Study: Christological Theories, 26: Ritschlianism, 2. (<i>The Rev. Water Drum, S.J., Woodstock College, Maryland</i>)	565
CRITICISMS AND NOTES:	
Fletcher: The Nature and History of the Bible	576
Cronin: The Science of Ethics—Vol. II: Special Ethics	576
Heuser: Canon Sheehan of Doneraile	581
Vassall-Phillips: The Work of St. Optatus against the Donatists	583
—: The Catholic Encyclopedia and its Makers	586
Sellars: The Essentials of Philosophy	586
LITERARY CHAT	588
BOOKS RECEIVED	591

DECEMBER.

	PAGE
DEVOTION TO THE DIVINE INFANT	593
The Rev. Barthold Mulleady, O.D.C., Dublin, Ireland.	
POPE BENEDICT XV AND THE FRANCISCANS	606
R. F. O'Connor, Belfast, Ireland.	
THE PRIEST AND NON-CATHOLICS	618
The Rev. Arthur Barry O'Neill, C.S.C., Notre Dame, Indiana.	
HONORING AMERICA'S SAINT	631
The Rev. Thomas M. Schwertner, O.P., New York City.	
THE FIRST BOOK OF THE NEW CODE OF CANON LAW	636
The Rev. Stanislaus Woywod, O.F.M., Paterson, New Jersey.	
LUTHER'S FAITH AND REASON	646
The Rev. J. C. Harrington, St. Paul, Minnesota.	
ANALECTA:	
ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV:	
I. Oppidum Brentwood in Episcopalem Civitatem erigitur in Anglia	660
II. Commissio ad Codicis Canones interpretandos	662
III. Conceditur ut Ordinis Praedicatorum Fratres, Sorores et Tertiarii in communi viventes accipere possint Absolutionem Generalem cum Indulgentia Plenaria die Festo B. M. V. a Rosario	664
SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII:	
Conceditur Indulgentia CCC dierum recitantibus Iaculatoriam Precem ad B. M. V. "a Fiducia"	665
STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:	
The Priest's Intention at Mass. (<i>The Rev. Edward R. James, Brynmawr, England</i>)	666
Catholic Journalism in Italy. (<i>The Very Rev. James P. Conry, Canon of St. Mark's, Rome, Italy</i>)	668
"Heart" Suggested as a Translation of "Viscera", in Bible Texts. (<i>J. F. S.</i>)	674
Conditional Absolution "in articulo mortis"	676
Evasion of Reservation	677
Funeral Mass "in die obitus"	678
Lauds at Office for the Dead	678
Prayer for Bishop in Canon of the Mass	679
Alcohol in Altar Wine	680
Patron of Aviators	680
Representations of the Immaculate Conception	680
Initial Invocation in Litany	681
Genuflecting at the Angelus	682
Choral Recitation of the Office	682
Hearing Confessions without Stole or Surplice	682
"Dominus Vobiscum" not to be Chanted in Litany	683
Distributing Communion after the Consecration	683
A Christmas Gift to the Holy Father	684
CRITICISMS AND NOTES:	
O'Daniel: The Very Rev. Charles Hyacinth McKenna, O.P.	686
Husslein: The Catholic's Work in the World	688
Denifle-Volz: Luther and Lutherdom	689
Campbell: Various Discourses	691
Walsh: Catholic Churchmen in Science	692
Browne: Our Renaissance	693
D'Alton: Horace and His Age	694
Smith: The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	697
Northrup: Laws of Physical Science	698
LITERARY CHAT	699
BOOKS RECEIVED	702

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(LVII).—JULY, 1917.—No. 1.

ST. PAUL'S MESSAGE ON THE MASS.

THAT the sacrificial nature of the Mass and his own distinct status as a sacrificing priest were expressly declared by St. Paul, in technical and liturgical terms, in his Epistle to the Romans, is a statement which may surprise non-Catholics who have been taught to believe that the Mass is an ecclesiastical invention. It is a statement which, I am convinced, rests on reliable foundations. It is based on the literal interpretation of Romans 15: 16,¹ a verse which, in my judgment, is one of the most noteworthy in the Bible, not only in view of its connexion with the Eleusinian mysteries at Athens and its employment of terms related to special features in this great national act of Greek worship, but also because it contains what is in all probability a direct quotation from the oldest Christian liturgy—the liturgy of St. James.

For Catholics, of course, this verse is by no means essential to prove the Catholic doctrine on the Mass. For us it is sufficient to know that the sacrificial nature of the Mass was defined as an article of faith by the Council of Trent, which thereby confirmed a doctrine contained in Holy Scripture, supported by unbroken tradition and always inherent in the mind of the faithful. No doctrine is richer in Scriptural proofs and predictions. From the time when Melchisedek the Canaanite, mysteriously crossing the path of Abraham, offered sacrifice of bread and wine, to Malachias's prophecy of the world-wide

¹ "That I should be the minister of Christ Jesus among the Gentiles: sanctifying the gospel of God, that the oblation of the Gentiles may be made acceptable and sanctified in the Holy Ghost."

sacrifice which should supersede the Jewish sacrifice, the Old Testament is full of types and prophecies which would be devoid of all practical significance if the Mass, which alone fulfils them, were not a fact. In the New Testament our Lord's words of consecration, preserved by the synoptists and St. Paul (I Cor. 9: 23, 24, 25), by themselves establish beyond question the sacrificial nature of the Mass.

But the illustration of doctrine appeals to Catholics, while for non-Catholics who attach such weight to the utterances of St. Paul, this verse should prove interesting in view of the fact that, if interpreted literally, it enriches Catholic doctrine with a proof neglected by the critics.

That by the work of the Holy Ghost, all words of Holy Scripture have a special purpose is a truth that need not be emphasized for believers in Divine inspiration. It was with a fundamental belief in the above truth that I first read Romans 15: 16, and this belief in conjunction with studies which had recently centred on a theme suggested by this verse, may explain the impression it made upon me. I had recently been reading Demosthenes and Lysias, in whose works the theme of the Athenian "liturgies" plays an important part. My attention was at once riveted by the fact that the word "leitourgos", which so frequently occurs in these authors, had been employed by St. Paul in Romans 15: 16 to denote his own apostolic office. The liturgist, as we may term him, of course, was the citizen who among other public duties undertook the office of *choregus* at the Eleusinian mysteries. One of the duties of the liturgist was to provide the material for sacrifice, as may be learned from the "Pax" of Aristophanes. The liturgist, in his capacity of *choregus* had to equip the sacrifice and other religious ceremonies with a magnificence worthy of the occasion and to gather together the chorus that took part in the Eleusinian festival. The fame of this festival was world-wide; the office of the liturgist was equally familiar.

With what object had St. Paul used the word "leitourgos"? was my question. It is an extraordinary word, with a peculiar history. Such extraordinary words would not be used at random by a divinely inspired writer. The singular associations of this word were known to St. Paul. When he visited Athens, the Eleusinian mysteries, which did not cease till the reign of

the Emperor Julian, were still an important feature of Greek religious life. The ideas that the word "liturgist" would at once raise in the minds of his Greek readers at Rome would surely not escape him. Why had he used this strange analogy and linked it with three other sacrificial terms?

Four technical sacrificial terms in one brief sentence are surely a phenomenon that would ordinarily be interpreted as indicating that the writer's theme was sacrifice in the proper sense of the term.

The first of these sacrificial terms is "leitourgos". The second sacrificial term is "hierourgounta", which had always signified in Greek "to perform the priestly function" and has still the same signification in modern Greek to-day.

The third sacrificial term is "prosphora," which is the ordinary Greek word for "oblation". The fourth sacrificial term is "hegiasmene," which is part of the very verb employed in the Epiklesis of Eastern liturgy to signify the act by which the Holy Ghost sanctifies the gifts on the altar at Mass.

A further striking feature is lent to this verse by the fact that the liturgy of St. James contains a passage practically identical with the words used by St. Paul in the latter part. In this liturgy, which is considered the earliest of all Christian liturgies, in a long prayer that precedes the "Prayer of the Veil", are the words: "Grant that our *offering may be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost.*" The resemblance between these words and verse 16 is too striking to be ignored. Was St. Paul, when he wrote Romans 15: 16, using language drawn from the liturgy of his day? That such a liturgy existed is almost beyond question. It is impossible to believe that, after the institution of the Eucharist, the Apostles would allow any great length of time to elapse without committing to writing the prayers of their central act of worship.

What then is the literal meaning of this verse? Every Greek scholar on the Continent will agree with me, I think, in my view that the original Greek of the verse has suffered greatly by translation. The reason, of course, lies in the difficulty of translating technicalities. Neither the Latin nor the English translation adequately represents the Greek of this passage. Knowledge of Greek has vastly increased since the days when the Bible was translated. Passages more or less

obscure in those days are easily interpreted to-day as the result of researches for parallel grammatical usages, and of wider historical knowledge.

The meaning of "*hierourgounta to euaggelion*" in this verse 16, for example, is stripped of all doubt by a practically parallel passage in the fourth book of the Maccabees, a somewhat rare work, it is true, but having a distinct value in its having been included in the Alexandrian manuscript of the Septuagint, and in its authorship being generally ascribed to Josephus. In the eighth verse of the seventh chapter of this work are the words "*tous hierourgountas ton nomon to idio haimati.*" Josephus was writing of the heroic death of Eleazar, who, by family a priest and by profession a lawyer, suffered martyrdom in the reign of Antiochus sooner than eat meats forbidden by the Mosaic law.

Eleazar died, says Josephus, in defence of his religion, being wise with divine wisdom, "and such," he says, "ought those to be who perform the priestly function of the law at the cost of their own lives," which is the translation of the words in question. These words clearly do not mean "who offer up the law as a sacrifice" (as they would mean if translated in the manner adopted by non-Catholic commentators in regard to Romans 15:16), but "who perform the sacrificial function of the law"—two entirely different ideas.

It will be seen that in the grammatical construction of the above passage in Maccabees, "*nomon*" is a quasi-cognate accusative, just as "*euaggelion*" is in Romans 15:16. The quasi-cognate accusative with a neuter verb, of which it limited the meaning to one of several applications, was a favorite Greek construction.

The literal meaning then of verse 16 would be as follows: "That I should be the sacrificial minister of Christ Jesus to the Gentiles, performing the priestly function of the Gospel of God, that the oblation of the nations may be acceptable, being sanctified in the Holy Ghost."

The sacrificial tenor of the above passage is indicated in the Revised Version of the King James Bible, where in the margin "*hierourgounta*" is rendered "ministering in sacrifice".

In examining the meaning of "*leitourgos*" in this passage I noted that the verb "*leitourgein*" was employed by the

writer of Acts of the Apostles in chapter 13, verse 2, to denote the celebration of Mass, as acknowledged by the Anglican scholar Dr. Mackenzie Walcott in his work on *Sacred Archaeology*. Equal reason, I argued, existed for the conclusion that "leitourgos" in Romans 15 : 16 must mean "celebrant of the Mass", for there seemed to me no grave reason for interpreting this word in any other but the ordinary grammatico-historical sense, analogical indeed but with no metaphorical signification excluding a real sacrifice.

With the literal translation accepted as the true one we may understand the impression that would be made at Rome by the reading of this verse.

The people at Rome to whom St. Paul was writing were partly members of the Catholic Church, and partly catechumens in course of instruction. Some were Jews converted or in the process of conversion. The majority were Gentiles. Greek, of course, was a familiar language at Rome, to such an extent indeed that Cicero once complained that there was danger of Latin being superseded on the lips of the fashionable youth. Some of these Gentiles had been educated at Athens, which was the fashionable centre of learning. They would thus be familiar with the Eleusinian mysteries and the associate liturgies. The native Greeks, who as Juvenal tells us, thronged Rome in those days, would also be sure to have diffused a knowledge of the religion of Greece, and of the national festivals that gave sensible form to the religious spirit. When they read or heard, then, the words of verse 15, they would understand them as follows: St. Paul declares that he is to be liturgist, that is to say, he will act as chief minister in some sacrifice. Secondly, they would say: St. Paul declares that he is to do the work of a priest of the gospel. Evidently they would say he is to be not merely liturgist but also hierophant, or chief priest. They knew that these words used by St. Paul in verse 16 were the very words used technically in connexion with Greece's great national act of worship, from which they would naturally conclude that St. Paul must be speaking of some similarly central Christian act of worship as supreme in the Christian Church as the Eleusinian mysteries were in the religious life of Greece. Nor was the sacrificial nature of the act which St. Paul was to perform merely declared in these

words. Further light on its nature was thrown by the words: "performing the priestly function of the Gospel of God, that the oblation of the Gentiles may be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost," which is the literal translation of the Greek. These words would be understood by the Greek-speaking converts and catechumens at Rome as meaning that in this central act of worship in which St. Paul was to be priest and celebrant, they themselves were to take part. So that, just as the Eleusinian sacrifice was offered by the hierophant in the name of the whole Greek people, the Christian sacrifice would be offered by St. Paul in union with the faithful.

How then did the non-Catholic commentators interpret this passage? I confess I was surprised by their universal silence in regard to its technical terms and historical associations.

The general trend of the non-Catholic commentators was to interpret the text metaphorically and expressly to exclude the literal interpretation. Dr. Handley Moule, the Anglican commentator, takes this view, and by "metaphorical" he means: excluding the notion of sacrifice in the proper sense. That old-time commentator, Barnes, observed that, if this passage did apply to sacrificial priesthood, it must be to a priesthood confined to the Apostles. As to reasons for his view he is silent. Professor Philippi observes that "the preaching of the gospel might be regarded as an offering of sacrifice", but as to the difference between sacrifice properly so-called and improperly so-called, he was silent. Why had all these commentators, I asked, ignored the technical terms and historical associations of this passage? Why had they adopted the metaphorical explanation and expressly excluded the literal interpretation without giving a reason? It seemed to me that in this respect the non-Catholic commentators were not doing themselves justice.

If "*leitourgos*" had been the only technical term in this passage, I could have understood the reason why some might think it should be interpreted metaphorically, as is the case with its kindred noun "*leitourgia*" in Philippians 2:30, where, however, it may be noted, there are no other technical terms in juxtaposition. But how critics could dispose of four technical sacrificial terms and of definite historical associations and pronounce against the literal interpretation, without assigning a reason, seemed to me a problem that required solution.

How would a modern Greek interpret this passage? seemed to me an important question. What would "hierourgounta to euaggelion" mean in modern Greek. If a modern Greek were asked to-day what he understood by the verb "hierourgein" he would answer that it signified the act of offering up sacrifice. Every educated modern Greek would tell us that just as "hiereus" is the Greek word for a priest in a private capacity, so "hierourgos" is the very word used to-day for a priest in his sacrificial function. At any rate I feel sure that no modern Greek would accept the non-Catholic translation of "hierourgounta to euaggelion" as "offering up the gospel." Surely modern Greeks are entitled to speak with some authority on the meaning of their own language. It is not as if the Greek language of St. Paul's time were not the Greek language of to-day. The language has preserved its identity to an extraordinary degree. "It has been the unique destiny of the Greek language", writes Professor Jebb, to have had from prehistoric times down to our own, an unbroken life. Not one link is lacking in the chain which binds the new Greek to the old.

The weakness of the general non-Catholic interpretation lay, it seemed to me, in departing from the literal sense and in expressly excluding it without furnishing any grave reason. Non-Catholics have their principles of interpretation, and I had previously noted that the rules laid down by Dr. Horne, the Anglican scholar, in his celebrated work on *The Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures*, were substantially the same as those given by the Catholic theologian, Cornely. The rules are as follows: The first is that for the ordinary grammatico-historical interpretation of the Sacred Scriptures three things are required: a knowledge of the significations proper to the words employed by the author; a definition of that signification which alone the author could couple with that word in the particular place according to the common laws of speech; a historical description of the idea which he really wished to express.

The second rule I found, was that when the various significations of a word are ascertained, the signification which the author intended, or the sense in the particular place, must be defined from the circumstances of his utterance. In this con-

nexion, Cornely emphasizes the important principle that the proper signification is not to be abandoned unless necessity compel. For metaphorical interpretation there must be obvious reasons.

The third rule given by Cornely is that the sense of a word is to be determined more accurately and closely from history.

How could the non-Catholic commentators reconcile their exclusively metaphorical interpretation with the above rules? was my question.

Not only does the exclusively metaphorical interpretation seem opposed to hermeneutical principles, but also to common sense. Before an exclusively metaphorical meaning can be given to a passage there must be reason for believing that the writer intended by his metaphor to exclude a literal meaning. Had St. Paul any such intention? If so, why did he employ four technical sacrificial terms which he must have known were certain to direct his readers' thoughts to the idea of a literal sacrifice? St. Paul was a Jew and Jews are practical men. Practical men avoid the use of misleading language.

Now if St. Paul had stated that he was to do the work of a liturgical minister and to offer up the sacrifice of the Gospel, when he only meant to say that he was to preach the Gospel and not to offer sacrifice, he would have merely been confusing his readers. He would have been using language that would not only mislead the people of his day, but which would continue to mislead successive generations of future Christians. St. Paul, as a scholar and practical man, would certainly not use language that would mislead his hearers. If he merely meant to declare that he was proud of preaching the gospel and nothing more, why should he not say so plainly and clearly without any useless addition of technical terms, associated with an idea of sacrifice foreign to his own belief? We will take a present-day example. Suppose a non-Catholic minister living in New York and hoping shortly to visit his brethren in Philadelphia, were to write a letter to them, expressing his great joy at the prospect of having been chosen by God to act in their midst as a sacrificial minister, and at the near prospect of celebrating amongst them a Gospel Mass, what would the people of Philadelphia think of him? Would they think this a satisfactory way of announcing that he hoped to preach a

sermon in a non-Catholic church in Philadelphia? Even if he explained subsequently that he was merely speaking metaphorically and had no intention of referring to a literal sacrifice, they would question his intelligence, and he would surely sink in their estimation to the level of a man who had not the wit to use plain speech when he wanted to speak plainly.

But St. Chrysostom draws a partly metaphorical meaning from a portion of this verse, some critic may urge. Precisely, but he does so in a homily or discourse on popular lines and not in a critical commentary. He was not discussing the text *ex professo*, but as a preacher, who looks upon a text as a means to edify his hearers. Thus the historical and archeological aspect of the text was outside his scope on this occasion. Apart too from the unfitness of historical and archeological discussions for popular discourses, the circumstances of his day presented an important reason for his silence on such a theme. Surrounding conditions had vastly changed since St. Paul's time. The opposition of the pagan world to Christianity had not then assumed a systematic and scientific form. St. Paul had never been confronted with the claim that Christianity was merely a disguised and degenerate paganism. In the conditions of his day he saw reasons for conciliating paganism by admitting its possession of a measure of truth and goodness. In the centuries, however, that had elapsed before St. Chrysostom's day new dangers had threatened the Faith. Celsus had endeavored to credit paganism with being the parent of all that was best in Christianity, and had compared the Christian mysteries with the mysteries of Mithras, to the disadvantage of the former, as Origen tells us. The neo-Platonists had asserted that Christianity could offer men nothing which could not be found in the Eleusinian mysteries. The pagan propagandism of Julian the Apostate was fresh in men's minds when Chrysostom wrote his homilies. It was a time of sharp antagonism between Christianity and paganism. The Christian apologists had widened the breach by their view that paganism was wholly a deplorable delusion. The Eleusinian mysteries had passed away with Julian's reign, and with his persecutions of the Christians still a recent memory, there was naturally no disposition among the theologians of Chrysostom's day to institute conciliatory comparisons with paganism. Thus,

when Chrysostom read Romans 15:16 he would see no reason to dwell on an analogy which, valuable as it had been in St. Paul's day, had been invested by altered conditions with a new and sinister aspect.

The chief point in St. Chrysostom's mind was that Christianity and paganism were essentially different. So with a text before him which might probably tend to foster a popular belief, if interpreted literally, that the Mass was a Christian counterpart of the Eleusinian mysteries, he had good reason for using the principle of economy. The metaphorical interpretation he knew had the advantage not merely of avoiding all dangerous comparisons, but also of including the literal interpretation.

So in his homily, St. Chrysostom rendered "*hierourgounta to euaggelion*" broadly by "*priestly ministering*", which, it is clear, included the ideas of both preaching and offering sacrifice. He well knew the hermeneutic principle that underneath each statement of the Sacred Scriptures a literal sense is to be found. As a Catholic critic he would never have thought of violating this principle by a gratuitous assertion that the metaphorical explanation excluded the literal one.

But why, it may be asked, were these technical sacrificial terms and historical associations of Romans 15:16 ignored by such able commentators as McEvilly, Piconio, and Cornelius à Lapide? From their comments on this passage I should say that they were far more concerned with the spiritual edification of their readers than with questions of classical scholarship. Piconio, for example, had a strong penchant for homiletic explanations. It must be noted, however, that one of these Catholic commentators excludes the literal interpretation.

That the literal interpretation of Romans 15:16 is favored by the context, I will attempt to show briefly. What else but the idea of the world-wide sacrifice spoken of so often in prophecy suggested the words of Romans 15:10 and 11: "*Rejoice, ye Gentiles, with his people,*" and again: "*praise the Lord, all ye Gentiles; and magnify Him, all ye peoples.*" How else could the Gentiles adequately praise and magnify their Lord, except by participation in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass? The joy of the Gospel for the Gentiles was that it led to Holy Communion. This then is the grace given to St. Paul

by God, of which he speaks in verse 15—the grace of Orders which is conferred that a man may consecrate the Eucharist and become a minister by whom, on his receiving jurisdiction, the fruits of Calvary may be applied to the souls of men.

What then was the message conveyed to the Christians at Rome in the Epistle to the Romans 15: 16? In this chapter, it is clear, St. Paul desired to dwell upon his apostolic office and work. As he was writing to both Jews and Gentiles, he had necessarily a message for both. He was on a pastoral visitation, as may be gleaned from Romans 1: 11; where he declared that he longed to see the people of Rome, that he may impart to them some spiritual grace. He had already visited Athens when he wrote this Epistle, and was familiar with the part played by the Eleusinian mysteries in the religious life of Greece. He knew well that many of the people to whom he was writing had either been initiated in the mysteries, or had witnessed them, and at any rate knew what they were. Consequently when he wrote verse 16, he must have wished to convey to his readers some information as to the Christian religion which could be only expressed by technical terms. To the Gentile catechumens, of whom there were many at Rome, the words would be especially significant. At the word "*leitourgos*" the thoughts of many of them would at once flash to Athens. The whole weird picture of the Eleusinian mysteries, with solemn sacrifice and hierophant in priestly vestments, would be reproduced in their mind's eye, and they would look forward to St. Paul's visit with a glowing expectation that all the wonders of Eleusis would be eclipsed by the Christian mysteries as completely as the gods of the pagan world were eclipsed by Jesus Christ.

For the Jewish catechumens the words "*hierourgounta* to *euaggelion*" would be especially significant, inasmuch as they indicated that the sacrifices of the Old Law were to be replaced by the sacrifice of the Gospel. To the Jewish converts and catechumens generally verse 16 would mark an epoch, as distinctly showing the Catholic character of the Christian Church, as contrasted with Jewish ideas of religion in which they themselves would be a favored caste.

The whole grand development of the Jewish creed from its national narrowness into a world-wide religion, embracing

Jew and Gentile; the fulfilment of the Jewish prophecies on a scale greater than had ever been dreamed of by the mass of the Jewish people; the unity of Jew and Gentile in a sacrifice that superseded not only the sacrifices of the Old Law but of all pagan religions; his own coming inauguration of this sacrifice in the mother-city of the world, where he would admit a vast throng of Jewish and Gentile converts to their first Communion; his realization of the fact that from among these converts many missionaries would go forth to spread the gospel of Christ to the farthest ends of the earth, and that thus would be fulfilled the Malachian vision of the world-wide sacrifice to be offered henceforth from "the rising of the sun to the going down thereof"—such were some of the thoughts that evidently suggested the message which St. Paul sent in the fifteenth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans.

H. T. E. RICHARDS.

London, Ontario.

THE PASTOR AND HIS SCHOOL SISTERS.

I.

THE Catholic Educational Association passed the following resolution at its last convention in Baltimore: "It is generally conceded that the most vital factor in the development of the parish school is the priest, and as the growth of the Church in this country depends primarily on the success of Christian education, it is recommended that each pastor be urged to do his utmost in the matter of visitation, examination, and sympathetic encouragement of the institutions under his charge."¹

The pastor's influence is, indeed, the determining factor in the character of the parish school. The pastor has it in his power to make or unmake his school, and that chiefly through his attitude toward his school sisters. The school building may be architecturally perfect, sanitary, and equal to all needs; the teachers may be capable, well trained, and eager to work; still, if the proper relations be lacking between the pastor and his school sisters, if there be estrangement, or open hostility, or even merely indifference between them, the teach-

¹ *Cath. Educ. Ass. Bulletin*, XIII, No. 1, p. 221.

ers' best efforts will largely be frustrated. Their scattered efforts can be unified only by the pastor's sympathetic encouragement of their work. Deprive the school of the pastor's directing hand and cheering encouragement, and there will be much wasted energy, there will be opposition in the pursuit of one and the same aim, and the sisters, when in doubt and anxiety, will not know to whom to turn for advice and help. In a word, there will be a school divided against itself, and the pastor need not be surprised if the fruits are disproportionate to the labors expended.

How different are the results if an earnest and self-sacrificing priest is the guide and friend of the sisters! Fundamentally his attitude toward his school sisters will be that of reverence. And how many reasons there are for paying them deep reverence! The American is known the world over for his reverence for womanhood, and the Christian sees in every woman a sister of the holy Mother of God. But our school sisters have titles over and above these to receive reverence from the Catholic and particularly from the priest. They are the chosen souls of the Most High, the spouses of Christ the King; they have left all that is dear to the human heart to follow the call of the Heavenly Bridegroom. They have bound themselves by the strongest ties to a special union with Christ, and Him they are following in the godly work of leading the little ones to their Master. The zeal and fervor with which they are striving after perfection and the fervor with which they are performing their arduous duties, may well compel the admiration of us priests and make us blush for our shortcomings. "Ah! these wonderful nuns! the glorious vivandières in the march of the army of Christ! No stars bedeck them, nor crosses; no poet sings of them; no trumpets blare round their rough and toilsome march and struggle; but some day the bederoll will be called, and the King's right hand will pin on their breasts the cross of His Legion of Honor."²

PROVIDING FOR THE SISTERS' SPIRITUAL AND PHYSICAL NEEDS.

The pastor should, above all, provide well for the spiritual needs of the school sisters. To do all in his power to preserve

² Sheehan, *Luke Delmege*, p. 108.

and nourish their spiritual life is the most effective means at his command to secure efficient teachers. A good religious will draw God's blessing upon her work; and after all it is the blessing of Heaven that counts most in moulding the clay plastic of the children's souls into strong Christlike characters. The pastor's example of piety, shown, for instance, in his visits to the Blessed Sacrament, will be a strong incentive to the sisters to persevere in their religious fervor. They will soon note and be edified by the priest's piety. "Father John is a very pious priest," observed one sister. "I have often seen him make a visit to the Blessed Sacrament before going over to the school or out for his daily constitutional."

The sisters should be made to feel that the pastor is sincerely interested in their spiritual welfare. They should know that he remembers them as his faithful co-workers in his Masses and prayers, and an occasional Mass said according to the sisters' intentions will strengthen the feeling of mutual solidarity. Let the priest look upon the sisters with the eyes of faith, and he will derive much spiritual benefit from their noble example. The mere sight of the sisters was an inspiration to the priest-hero of Canon Sheehan's novel: "And often and often as Luke's heart failed him, and he felt he was powerless against the awful iniquity that surged around him, the sight of these sisters, moving quietly through hideous slums, and accepting insults as calmly as their worldly sisters receive compliments; or their white lips blanched by the foul air of their schools . . . smote him with shame, and nerved him by the tonic of noble example for far higher and greater work."³

The pastor, however, should be solicitous also about the bodily well-being of his school sisters. That the living conditions of the sisters are no mean factor in preserving their health was ably proved in these pages⁴ by a physician with some thirty years' experience in the professional treatment of nuns. This physician did not hesitate to say, "With the possible exception of the very poor, there is no class of people who live with so many privations of those things which conduce to bodily comfort, as do our nuns." He pleaded justly for a large and healthful house for each community of sisters. The

³ *Ibid.*, p. 109.

⁴ Vol. XLIX (1913), pp. 224 ff.

convent should be large enough to provide each sister with a cell, and, if possible, a plot of ground should surround the house. If it is impossible to have that, the roof of the convent should be so arranged that it can be used as a place for recreation. When building a new convent, the pastor should take counsel of the Mother Superior of the respective community of sisters. We priests know little of the sisters' needs, and architects likewise have little experience in these matters. It is, therefore, best to seek the advice of the sisters' Superior.

The pastor should not be miserly in providing the convent with the necessary furniture. Many priests are poor observers of the needs of others, especially of religious women, and hence the pastor may well urge his sisters to tell him of their needs. The priest's housekeeper may at times be a good counsellor with regard to the sisters' needs. As the school sisters must spend practically all their time indoors, special attention should be given to the lighting, heating, and ventilation of the convent as well as of the school. Let us be less intent on multiplying comforts in our home than of providing what is needed in the convent.

The sisters' need of fresh air will be unquestioned by the priests who have read Father O'Neill's eloquent plea on the subject.⁵ The pastor will perform an act of charity by asking the sisters' superior to have that article read publicly from time to time. He should encourage his teachers to practise the gospel preached by Father O'Neill by allowing them sufficient leisure to go out for an occasional walk.

The financial remuneration doled out to the school sisters is little enough, "the merest pittance of pecuniary retribution," as Archbishop Ireland calls it. For themselves personally they get merely food, scant raiment, and a cot for sleep and rest. Let the pastor give this little at least with a glad hand and heart, without any unnecessary delay, especially in these days of increased cost of living. There may be most pressing need of the few dollars. It is desirable that the pastor pay the salary to the sisters instead of their being compelled to collect it from the pupils. Still, conditions may render the latter unavoidable. Under no circumstances, however, should the

⁵ *Health and Holiness in Convents*, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, XLIX, pp. 17 ff.

teachers be compelled to conduct entertainments to collect their salaries. These entertainments are detrimental to the interests of the school. Though a considerable sum may be cleared for the parish, the profit is obtained at too high a cost. The demands upon the modern parish school are so many and so exacting that it is a shortsighted policy to spend any part of the school period on fads and frills such as the majority of school entertainments consist of. The sisters are, as a rule, strongly opposed to these entertainments, for they feel that the weary rehearsals sap their strength more than any amount of school work. Pastors, too, have come to see the harmful features of the average school entertainment: "The parents are paying for their children and their loss of time," as one pastor puts it,⁶ "in order that they may be taxed an additional sum of 50 cents or one dollar toward the salary of the teachers."

II.

What shall be the pastor's attitude toward the school work of his sisters? That the pastor should do his utmost to erect a suitable school building and one that meets all reasonable requirements with regard to the health and the comfort of teachers and pupils, is unquestioned. But with regard to the relations between the pastor and his school sisters after the school is in running order, *praxis est multiplex*.

DIFFERENT METHODS OF CONTROL OF SCHOOLS.

Father A lives up to the principle: "The schools fare best when the clergy hold aloof from them and leave all to the judgment and experience of the good sisters." Father B, however, finds fault with this *laissez faire* system, and thinks that the priest should take an active share in managing the school. But he, too, thinks his time taken up with more important matters, and consequently delegates his authority in the school to his two assistants, of whom the one has charge of the four lower, and the other of the four higher grades. Father C, a firm advocate of men teachers (he has told even his sisters that he regards them as but a lesser evil in his school), is bent on instilling as much of his masculinity as pos-

⁶ *Cath. Educ. Ass. Bulletin*, IV, No. 1, p. 273.

sible into his teachers and their pupils. He practically lives in the school. The sisters are but his assistant teachers. He dictates their methods down to the minutest details; arranges their horarium; and will linger for hours in one classroom for the purpose of illustrating his methods to a less docile sister. To escape this ordeal, the sisters have learned to divest themselves of their individuality and strive to copy the alleged beau ideal in all points. Should any sister prove self-willed and persist in her belief that her own methods may also be of some account, she will soon be reported as a hopeless case to the Mother Superior, and the latter has no other choice than to recall all her sisters—as several communities have already done, in a case known to the writer—or to send a more pliable subject.

Father D, on the contrary, is not so self-assertive: he does not consider himself the principal of the school, for he has a sister to act in that capacity. He directs the general policy of the school after the manner of a school superintendent.

With all these differences, there is one belief common to all four pastors: each one believes his system the best, and each one seems to think that his sisters likewise regard the prevailing conditions as perfectly satisfactory. But with regard to the sisters' attitude toward the various methods, let us not be too quick in taking silence or acquiescence for approval of all that we pastors do in our schools. The shrewd Napoleon has remarked that women are born actresses, and sisters are often quite skilful in concealing their real mind on certain conditions. All sisters, however, are sincerely anxious to have the pastor interested in their school, and the only debatable point is to decide how we shall show this interest.

It is very difficult and, in fact, impossible to lay down a hard-and-fast rule, but we venture, nevertheless, to say that Father C's method of acting as the principal of his school may be tolerated in the case of some lay teachers; but in the case of religious teachers it is not conducive to successful school management.

TOO MUCH INTERFERENCE WITH THE SISTERS' TEACHING.

Let the pastor, above all, beware of interfering too much with the sisters' teaching by laying down minute directions.

If you wish to get the best work out of a teacher, you must allow her a certain amount of independence. "Nothing great or living," says Newman, "can be done except when men are self-governed and independent; this is quite consistent with a full maintainance of ecclesiastical supremacy. St. Francis Xavier wrote to Father Ignatius on his knees; but who will say that St. Francis was not a real centre of action?"⁷ If independence is needed for success in other fields, it is surely needed for success in teaching. Professor Paulsen, one of the greatest of modern educational writers, says in this connexion: "It is essential to the health and joyousness of the minds of both teacher and taught that the school should do something that is not prescribed and not controlled by any outside authority. . . . Formerly every teacher was sovereign in his classroom, but now, unfortunately, little is missing to have that work which is by its very nature most spontaneous and most personal, hedged in most narrowly by rules and regulations."⁸

THE INDIRECT METHOD EXPLAINED.

The wise pastor will apply the indirect method in controlling his school. It is the method that is followed by the presidents of the great business corporations: they direct the general policy of the firm, but leave the carrying out of the details to the inferior officers and desire that the latter employ their own initiative and ingenuity in solving the problems they may be confronted with. The pastor will achieve more by gently suggesting certain lines of procedure than by domineering. "This indirect method is as effective," says Bishop McDevitt, "as the direct method, and without the possible drawbacks of the latter. The indirect method does not mean a *laissez faire* policy. It implies on the part of the priest all the knowledge that the direct method requires. It demands that he should know something of the principles and methods of teaching; that he should have prudence, tact, good judgment, self-restraint, self-control, and a due respect for the rights and feelings of others, especially of the teachers and the principal; that he should know his school in every part, the children, their par-

⁷ Ward, *The Life of John Henry Cardinal Newman*, London, 1912, I, p. 367.

⁸ *Pharus* (Donauwörth), V, (1914), p. 302.

ents, their home conditions, and the educational needs of the particular community. The indirect method does not call for less interest than the direct. It centres the responsibility upon those who are doing the actual teaching."⁹

COÖPERATION OF PASTORS AND SISTERS.

It is most desirable for the relations between the pastor and his teachers that there be coöperation. All regulations should tend to promote the spirit of mutual helpfulness. The sisters are anxious for the coöperation of the priest, and the pastor should strive to secure for all his efforts the help of every teacher in his school. With it his school is a success; without it, notwithstanding the best course of study, the best text-books, and the most efficient teachers, his school is a failure. Coöperation is the foundation for which there can be no substitute; but, to be truly effective, it must be grounded, as a diocesan school superintendent observes, "on mutual faith, trust, confidence, courtesy, respect, justice, and sympathy".

The pastor may do much toward securing this coöperation by cheerfully submitting to the regulations binding both himself and his teachers, *i. e.* the bishop's regulations, the ordinances of the diocesan school board, or other legitimate authorities. The example of the priest's obedience will go a long way toward obtaining the teachers' willing submission to regulations that the pastor may deem imperative for the success of his school. In choosing the text-books the pastor should abide by the decisions of the school board, or, in case there be no regulations on this head, select them with the advice of his teachers. The text-books are the teacher's tools, and the experienced teacher is a better judge than the average pastor of the availability of her tools.

The pastor will do well to recognize the authority of the local superior of his teachers in the school as well as in the community. He should, as a rule, communicate through this superior his wishes and directions to them, instead of dealing with them separately and as individuals. As a corollary of this recognition he will hold the same superior responsible for the execution of all his orders by all the teachers in the school.¹⁰

⁹ *Cath. Educ. Ass. Bulletin*, X, No. 1, p. 306.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, XI, No. 1, pp. 259 ff.

A principal of the school, who will be free to give all or most of her time to the supervision of the school, will lighten the pastor's task immeasurably. She will visit each classroom every day, assist the weaker teachers, deal with disciplinary cases, coach backward pupils and correct any defects she may note in the teaching methods of any sister. She should be an expert teacher, and the salary paid to such a principal will be a most profitable investment, especially in the case of a large school.

THE PASTOR'S VISITS TO THE SCHOOL.

The presence of a school principal does not dispense the pastor from making his daily visit to the school. No matter what his duties may be in other regards, he should attend the school at least for a few minutes every day, if it is only to go to the door and say "Good morning," and look around to note the attendance and to inquire about the absentees. The pastor should know every teacher and every pupil personally. The boys and girls of to-day are the men and women of to-morrow, and if the pastor show himself indifferent to them in school, they will, as men and women, show the same, if not greater, indifference to him. The purpose of these visits should be the encouragement of the teachers as well as of the pupils. The pastor should show a lively interest in what is going on in the schoolroom, should note the progress of the pupils, and evince his interest by adroit questions pertaining either to the subject or topics of general interest. However, the pastor should beware of proposing such questions as are beyond the capacity of the pupils, else he may discourage them.

The pastor should be on his guard in the remarks he makes in the presence of the teacher and her pupils. Especially should he beware of criticizing, say, the regulations of the diocesan school board, of the text-book, or the adding of such and such a branch to the curriculum. There may, indeed, be room for criticism on all these points, but the children are not the authorities to discuss these topics with. Incautious remarks of this nature may neutralize some of the best efforts of the teacher.

Needless to say, the pastor's calls should be brief, and loquacity is out of place, if anywhere, in visiting a schoolroom:

the moments are precious and the subject-matter to be learned is endless. The visit of the pastor, instead of being annoying interference, should be looked forward to with pleasure by both teacher and pupils. The teacher should receive a word of sympathetic encouragement or hear a timely and suggestive question that may give her thought a wiser direction, afford some helpful aid, and waken a deeper interest in the pupils, which shall prove an inspiration, an encouragement amid the toils and trials of her life.

The pastor's visit should be a ray of sunshine peering through the dark clouds, but not a storm with thunder and lightning in its wake. A word of judicious praise will stimulate the teacher as well as her pupils to exert their best efforts. The encouragement of his school sisters is one of the most useful, the noblest, and holiest of occupations a pastor could take up. All our teachers need encouragement, and if the pastor cultivates the faculty of seeing the good work his sisters are doing, he will never lack material wherewith to cheer the sinking spirits of his teachers. Let him praise a sister in one thing, and she will try to do her best in everything. The pastor who is chary of praising his sisters, will never obtain the best service they are capable of. If he notice enthusiasm on the part of his teachers, he should enter into it, for real teaching is 90 per cent enthusiasm. Next to God's grace it is enthusiasm alone that can tide the teacher over the thousand little trials that come to her daily.

An occasional present is a substantial token of the pastor's grateful appreciation of what the sisters are doing for his parish. It is obviously inadvisable to make any presents to an individual sister. Still a present given to the community is a token of good-will and may be made the source of much pleasure and even usefulness to the teachers. Thus one pastor has for years been giving his sisters very substantial Christmas gifts in the form of paid subscriptions for the *Catholic Educational Review*, *Catholic School Journal*, and one or other Catholic magazine, or a set of books. In this way the convent library, which is woefully neglected in many places, has enjoyed a steady growth, and the pastor has the satisfaction of having spent his money for the intellectual and spiritual advancement of his present and future teachers.

WINNING THE CONFIDENCE OF HIS SISTERS.

Trust and confidence is one of the greatest secrets of the art of education as well as of government. The pastor should make his sisters feel that he trusts them fully and implicitly in their sphere of labor. He will get what he gives in trust and affection. If he does not trust his sisters, he will find his faith justified; none will trust him, and he may find some to try their wits upon him. "The talisman that turns dross to gold is your own faith in your fellowman. Whatever you believe him to be, that he will become. He will come up or down to it, as you make your demand."¹¹ Confidence is a virtue of the ruler, the educator, and, therefore, of the pastor also. Hence the pastor should not resort to any kind of espionage in regard to his teachers; nor should he play the eavesdropper during school hours. Such practices cannot long escape the sisters' knowledge, and they are about the most effective means to rob them of all confidence in the pastor. Instinctively we all act on the principle embodied in the German proverb, that he who does not trust us, cannot be trusted.

HOW TO DEAL WITH THE TEACHERS' FAULTS.

The school sisters are human, and the pastor manifestly can not praise every teacher nor everything that even his good teachers may be doing. The pastor will note at times obvious mistakes and glaring faults, and he will find the treatment of these a delicate matter indeed. Of one point there can be no doubt: if he must find fault with the teacher, he may never do so in the presence of her pupils. Though the sister may have committed a mistake, she must still exact the obedience and respect of the children, and to do so will be extremely difficult, if not impossible, if reprimanded and humiliated before her pupils. Even for his own sake the pastor will wisely postpone the needed reprimand until after the school hours, for there is always the danger of his losing his temper if he corrects the sister as soon as he has perceived her mistake.

We are, every one of us, sensitive on the point of being reprimanded in public, and it is prudent to spare the feelings of our sisters in this regard. One of our teaching brothers

¹¹ Riis, *Theodore Roosevelt*, Washington, 1904, p. 404.

has stated that "the pastor cannot win the affections of a teacher quicker, nor hold them more enduringly than when he saves the teacher from public humiliation in cases where the teacher has made a mistake in class, and has, for instance, lost his temper; and let me tell you, friends, a teacher generally knows when he has lost his temper, if not at the moment, soon afterward. The case is brought to the pastor and he takes it in hand. He makes himself acquainted with the situation and takes control of it. He explains matters to the parents and pacifies them. Instead of publicly blaming the teacher, the latter is spoken to in private and given advice and warning. Now, that teacher will never forget the pastor who has saved him from humiliation in public."¹²

We admit that the pastor may find his patience sorely tried by some of his school sisters. The demand for teachers is far greater than the supply, and thus the superiors are compelled to send, against their better judgment, ill-trained sisters or obvious misfits into the schools. Let the pastor, however, even in such trying cases, preserve his soul in patience. Let him take counsel with the local superior or principal, and with the kindly coöperation of all concerned the indifferent teacher may in the course of time be trained to be equal to her arduous task. Even in the case of a hopelessly poor teacher the pastor is never justified in abusing the sister who may be doing her very best, nor should he peremptorily demand her removal; but let him first inquire of the authorities whether a substitute teacher be not available. He should, by all means, spare the feelings of the incompetent teacher as well as of her sisters in religion, who feel keenly any charge of incompetence made against one of their community.

In most cases the pastor had best make up his mind to the prospect of having some sisters in his school who are but second-best teachers. Many priests expect too much of their school sisters, and they will never find a sister to measure up to their ideal of a school teacher. Most of us have long ago resigned ourselves to the fact that very many members of the clergy are after all but second-best pastors, and consequently we should expect, and not be surprised, that there

¹² *Cath. Educ. Ass. Bulletin*, IV, No. 1, p. 271.

are a good many sisters who are but second-best teachers. Each teacher has her individuality, and we should be slow to condemn a method of teaching that may in itself be less perfect, but, given the present teacher's individuality, is the one with which she accomplishes most. The pastor is, generally speaking, not a trustworthy judge of teaching methods employed in the primary grades. It has been well said that the teacher's attitude in these grades should be that of a mother, and we priests may as well admit that the sisters are better qualified than we to mother the little ones.

In the presence of the children the pastor should sustain his school sisters, as far as possible, in all things. The teacher may be in error on a certain point, but the children should feel that the pastor is standing by her as a loyal friend and firm support. In any untoward event he should see the teacher through and out of difficulties before thinking of censuring her. True, there may be a difference of opinion; there may be estrangement owing to irreconcilable differences in temperament: but the pupils or their parents should never be led to suspect it. The pastor as well as the school sisters should so conduct themselves toward one another as though each regarded the other as perfect. Any other attitude will lead to gossip of all sorts that cannot but undermine much of the good work of both the Church and the school. The pastor should not accept any dictation from the parents anent the sisters' methods of teaching; all should know that the pastor and the sisters are capable and determined, too, to conduct the school independently of outside masters and mistresses.

IMPARTIALITY TOWARD THE SISTERS.

A point difficult to observe for the pastor is that of impartiality in dealing with the sisters. It cannot be denied that the teaching methods of one sister will appeal more to the pastor than those of another; but he must be on his guard lest he show any partiality for her on this account. This would soon be noticed and might lead to jealousy and discord among the teachers. Much more reprehensible is it for the pastor to insist on having just a certain teacher in his school and to go so far in his demands as to demand categorically: *Aut haec aut nulla*. Such demands, particularly if they become public,

cannot but lead to harmful results for the pastor himself as well as for his teaching staff. When speaking about the individual sisters, especially in the presence of other sisters, he should be very careful, as even his guarded expressions may be misunderstood and misconstrued. Some pastors are tempted to gossip about their sisters. Shortcomings they have, no doubt; they are not angels, and they will be the first to admit this; but this does not justify any one in enlarging their peccadilloes into crimes, particularly not in the hearing of outsiders, be they priests or laymen—or women. It is imprudent to criticize the sisters' superior except in case of necessity and then only to her respective superior. The pastor's want of respect for any person invested with authority will harm himself most.

THE PASTOR AS A SUBSTITUTE TEACHER.

Should the pastor undertake to teach, even if only for a short time, in the presence of the teacher? The writer is inclined to think it inadvisable. The pastor is either superior in teaching ability, and then the sister's authority will suffer by comparison and she may herself be utterly discouraged; or he is inferior, and then he himself is likely to lose respect in the eyes of his teachers or perhaps even pupils. He will find it best to assist while teaching is going on, content with a few words or questions to the children to show his sympathetic interest in them and their work.

The pastor has a splendid opportunity for the display of didactic skill in his religious instruction, which he or his assistants should conduct in each school-room for at least two class periods a week. It stands to reason that every priest who stands at the head of a parish school should know at least the elements of pedagogy. Pedagogy ought, on this account, to be considered essential to the seminary curriculum. If equipped with didactic skill and knowledge, the pastor may by his religious instruction provide a striking object-lesson of teaching methods for the imitation and inspiration of his school sisters.

THE PASTOR'S HOBBIES IN THE SCHOOL-ROOM.

It is proper that we have our hobbies; but it is to be regretted that some of us persist in forcing our hobby, be it his-

tory, botany, music, or one of the 'ologies or 'isms, upon the already overburdened parish school. The sisters may be coerced by moral suasion or considerations of prudence to submit to the pastor's demands with regard to his pet subject; the children, too, may respond in order to win the pastor's approving smile; but the school and the essentials will suffer. Hence we should be on guard lest our fondness for a special subject lead us to overestimate its value for the elementary school, whose prime function is to equip the children for the struggles of the workaday world. A careful attention to the requirements of the diocesan school board and the horarium arranged by the sister will safeguard us against obtruding with any fetish of our own. It will prevent us from appearing at all hours with the command to let the children march to the hall where we wish to try out with them the new song we have just bought or to demonstrate the new method of teaching astronomy which was discovered yesterday in Public School No. 5.

THE PARISH SCHOOL IS NOT A BURDEN.

At the dedication of a parish school you will occasionally hear a brother-priest sympathizing with the pastor in this fashion: "My sympathy is with you, for now you have no leisure at all; your work is now doubled, and you will be tied down to the strictest routine duties." Such a statement indicates a false attitude of mind. The parish school is not a place to work in, but a force to work with. It is, in fact, the strongest and most effective force that the priest has at his command to save the immortal souls of the young and thus insure permanence to his parish. The parish school is not a burden, but a most wonderful agency to lighten the pastor's labors. The pastor should take this true point of view when his sisters appeal to him for supplies, maps, reference works, or other didactic apparatus that may be urgently needed in the school-room. In the school the sisters are rearing living temples of God, and the expenditures we make on them are far more profitable than any investment in those of brick and mortar.

OVERTAXING THE SCHOOL SISTERS.

The zealous pastor will do all in his power to lighten the sisters' burden and to facilitate their building up the living

temples of the Holy Ghost. Our schools are frequently overcrowded. No teacher, be she ever so able, can do justice to sixty or even more pupils. Furthermore, it is expecting too much of the school sisters to have them act, as it were, as general utility nuns. It is a wise law passed in some of our dioceses that prohibits the school sisters from taking charge of the altar and sacristy. The work of teaching is so arduous,¹³ and the preparation for the class-room and the correction of the compositions and exercises take up so much of the precious little leisure of the sisters, that both the work of the school and the health of the teachers must suffer if they are compelled to do any work over and above that of teaching. Efficiency is the cry of the hour, and this selfish consideration, if no higher, should prevent us from asking any supererogatory work of the school sisters: "Pluribus intentus minor est ad singula sensus." It is true, there are some school sisters who are most eager to do all the chores for the pastor and his housekeeper; but these sisters are never known for particular efficiency in the school-room. The pastor engages his sisters for his school, and he should be satisfied with their work in the school and should not expect them to be teachers, sacristans, sextons, janitors, sodality prefects, organists, church choirs, bazaar managers, picnic helpers, theatrical producers, etc., all rolled into one.

On this score there is, even with the best of priests, room for self-examination. One of our number, the late Heinrich Hansjakob, has remarked that we priests are particularly liable because of our solitary lives to become selfish, domineering, and over-exacting with others.¹⁴ Each and everyone of us should make the treatment of his school sisters the occasional subject of his meditation. Let us compare our day's work with theirs, and we shall have reason enough to moderate our

¹³ One of the popular and *truthful* slogans in the magazines reads: "The teacher gives of herself probably more than do those in any other of the world's professions—physically, mentally, nervously, and vocally even."

¹⁴ "In jedem Geistlichen steckt vom Stande aus etwas Herrschsucht, weil der Zölibat Hagestolze und damit Egoisten von Natur aus schafft." Hansjakob, *In Italien*, p. 170. Cf. the following saying of the Profitless Daniel in *Extension* (Dec. 1916, p. 38): "A confirmed bachelor is a confirmed mortal whose soul dwells in an unapproachable fortress of single-blessedness. His stronghold is bounded on the north by *conservatism*; on the south by *despotism*; on the east by *egotism*; and on the west by *conceitism*."

excessive demands upon their leisure. A priest who has grown grey and wise in the service of the Master expresses himself on the subject in this manner: "If our priests had but half the zeal of our school sisters and did but half the work that they do, the Catholic Church in America would be nigh perfect."

A SCHOOL SISTER'S VIEW.

The writer cannot resist the temptation to quote what he considers an apt, if long, commentary on all that has been said. The following quotation was written, upon request, by a sister who represents a large community, and who has herself been engaged in parish school work both in the East and the West. Her words are worth pondering for she treats the subject from the sister's point of view—a point of view that may be novel to some of us—and gives at the same time both the dark and the bright side of the picture. To quote:

Sisters would be more successful if they had more encouragement and a little assistance from the pastor. The sisters love their work, and labor from morning until late at night to make their schools the success that the pastor so often boasts of. They need encouragement. They do not always get it. The pastor comes to visit his school, and it is with a throb of the heart that the poor teacher meets him with a smile; but if her mouth opened her heart would leap out, she is so unnerved. The poor children show their fear in their pale faces and fast-beating little hearts; you can hear them breathe; the stillness of the class-room that was a few seconds ago a busy beehive has become painful—through fear of whom? the pastor; because he never comes but to find fault, to threaten, to punish, or to expel. What money, salary, or other remuneration can sufficiently repay the poor delicate sister that teaches in such a school? A frail, delicate being before she entered religion, her life in the convent has not strengthened her physically; observance of vows and rules has made her, naturally, more tender, gentle and sensitive; life in such a school makes her feel that she is nothing but a hireling. Often she is not only the teacher, but the janitor, the sacristan, the organist, and the choir. She soon begins to fade. Consumption slowly but surely bears away one of the convent's brightest, brainiest, and most talented loved ones. Her early death has been hastened, at least, by the strain brought on by the peculiar environment of the school.

Thank God, the picture has another side. There are pastors great, grand, noble, tender as a mother; giants in form, but with hearts like that of a gentle girl. I have taught for them. They come into the class-room, and teachers and children are delighted. Recitation is too short; each child is so eager for the word of praise that falls from the pastor's lips. As he goes from grade to grade, the building echoes with the merry voices and cheery "Good morning, Father," or "Good-by, Father," issuing from children's mouths.

Such a pastor has little difficulty in getting all his children to attend the school. The sisters have a father to whom they can appeal in case of need; he is ever ready to listen, to advise, to assist. In the school of such a pastor teaching becomes a pleasant labor, cheerfulness and happiness pervade the class-room. The pastor is ever ready to lend a helping hand; even when he is absent, his influence permeates the very atmosphere. His school is a great success, and so will be all the parish schools of the United States when *the pastors put themselves in the teachers' place and do as they would be done by.*¹⁵

AVOID UNDUE FAMILIARITY.

Though the zealous pastor is ever ready to assist his school sisters in their arduous labors, he will, if prudent, be on his guard against any undue familiarity with them. He will never presume that his priestly vows or the sisters' habits secure him or them against the wily temptations of the evil one. On the contrary, he will remember the wise warning of St. Alphonsus with regard to our dealing with the "personae spirituales, cum quibus est periculum majoris adhaesionis. Unde angelicus doctor dicit: 'Licet carnalis affectio sit omnibus periculosa, ipsis tamen magis perniciosa, quando conversantur cum persona, quae spiritualis videtur. Nam quamvis principium videatur purum, tamen frequens familiaritas domesticum est periculum, quae quidem familiaritas quanto plus crescit, infirmatur principale motivum et puritas maculatur; sicque spiritualis devotio convertitur in carnalem.' Oh quot sacerdotes, qui antea erant innocentes, Deum simul et spiritum perdidierunt!"¹⁶

In the presence of his school sisters the prudent pastor will be particularly careful of his deportment, and his gentlemanly

¹⁵ *Cath. Educ. Ass. Bulletin*, IV, No. 1, pp. 267-268.

¹⁶ Amberger, *Pastoraltheologie*, 3rd ed., Regensburg, 1869, pp. 763-764.

manners will prove a safeguard of his virtue. He will be solicitous not only about the purity of his conscience but also about his reputation, which is so easily tarnished by the suspicions and the gossip of the malicious. Let us look the facts in the face: it is not only the non-Catholics but our Catholic parishioners as well that count the pastor's visits to the convent, and, to put it mildly, they are not edified by frequent calls. St. Jerome's words are to the point: "Quid si dixeris mihi: 'Mihi sufficit conscientia mea, habeo Deum judicem, qui meae vitae est testis; non curo, quid loquantur homines;' audi apostolum scribentem: 'providentes bona non solum coram Deo, sed etiam coram hominibus.'" ¹⁷ At the present time the world is just as eager to convict the priest on the smallest evidence or appearance of guilt as in the days when St. Jerome warned the cleric Nepotianus: "Caveto omnes suspiciones, et quidquid probabiliter fingi potest, ne fingatur, ante devita."

SACERDOS.

THE PRIEST IN MEDIEVAL LITERATURE.

THERE was a time when all of the Western World was Catholic, when the Church and the priests who were officers in the Church were common to every place and parish. The monasteries were the repositories of learning as well as of manuscripts. The clergy were the *literati* as well as the readers of the age. The conventional picture of a monk sitting by a window either conning an old manuscript or transcribing its contents into a new and richly illuminated manuscript of his own—this picture is, like most conventional things, true. But the desire for reading material did not stop at merely copying what had been handed down from of old time. And so it happens that we have Thomas Aquinas making and reciting very good limericks in his hours of recreation; we have lyric poems of a religious nature which these men penned to the praise of Christ and Mary; we have biographical narratives of the holy men who had preceded them written down to enlighten future generations and to excite an emulation in the breasts of

¹⁷ Pruner, *Pastoraltheologie*, Paderborn, 1901, Vol II, p. 150.

men to come; ¹ we have, as every student of the drama knows, Christmas, Easter, and "Boy Bishop" celebrations which served distinctly literary purposes as well as devotional and useful ones. At first these beginnings of modern stagecraft were purely religious in tone; ² but starting with the essentially humorous situation of Noah and his wife boxing ears, they began to be entertaining as well as instructive. Then it came to pass that the roadside jugglers, players, and performers were gradually introduced as assistants until the primary purpose was to amuse. Under such circumstances, the drama left the cloister, the church, and the churchyard, and fell into the hands of the professional strolling actors and of the trade guilds of the town. Naturally the more these presentations drifted from the pure type of moralities and miracle plays—a type not far remote from the saints' legends ³—the more the ecclesiastics drifted away from them. It is a matter in which there is little probability of giving accurate dates, or even of attributing any successive stages of drift, because we know that some churchmen banned theatrical things early and other ones retained them late. For instance, some of the best of the dramatic allegories date very late, in fact very close to the Protestant Revolt; and on the other hand we find in the *Annales Burtonenses* (1258) the following statement:

It is permitted to give food to actors because they are poor, not because they are actors; but their plays must not be seen nor heard, not permitted to be acted before the abbot or the monks.

Nor were this connexion with dramatic development and the writing of holy books the only active relationships between the ecclesiastics and literature. They did much writing of a more formal and valuable nature. Caedmon may have sung his pious songs; but Layamon wrote his serious books. Says Layamon at the beginning of his work:

¹ See *Saints' Legends*, by G. H. Gerould; Boston, 1916; which has received approval and condemnation, respectively, from the reviewers in *The Catholic World* and in *America*.

² Said Thomas Lodge in 1579: "For Tragedies & comedies, Donate the grammarian sayth they were inuentyd by lerned fathers of the old time to no other purpose but to yeelde prayse vnto God for a happy haruest or plentiful yeere." St. Francis of Assisi is supposed by some to have devised the first Nativity play; see *Life* by Father Cuthbert, pp. 393-394.

³ Cf. the *Play of St. Catherine*, now lost, dating from Dunstable, 1119.

There was a priest of yore,
Layamon the name he bore; . . .
There he read books, verily,
And the thought upon him fell,
In his mind he pondered well,
How folks might by him be told
Of the noble deeds of old.

And so we had best conclude that the early churchmen were very active in literary matters; that they worked up popular lives of the saints out of traditional material; that they adapted the liturgy with accretions for a somewhat theatrical presentation; that they compiled such serious and learned histories as their resources in books permitted; that they lightened their hours or intensified their devotions by writing lyric poems of a light, a devotional, or a penitential nature.

Yet, a far more interesting and illuminating problem than this, is the question as to how the prelates, the priests, and the monks were depicted in such literature as in slightly later times came from the hands of laymen and others who represented in their works the social life of their age. We can say with truth that, in the very beginning of fiction itself, priests were made to take their places in the old folk-tales of the nations. They appear in the French *fabliaux* and in the Italian *novella*. They are found in the narratives of Margaret of Navarre, of Boccaccio, of Matteo Bandello, of Giovanni Fiorentino. Chaucer painted them large in the landscape of medieval England. John Heywood handled them carelessly in his interludes, particularly in *The Pardoner and the Frere* and in *John, Tyb his Wife, and Sir John*. But the characteristic thing about most of these stories is that they are not characteristic at all. They stand either for naughty humor or for class satire. The monks and the priests seemed to be fair game for the wit-loving writer; and this type of book was not so much unrepresentative of society as it was disrespectful. But in other literature of the same realistic class, at least in so far as it was realistic, we find Pulci writing of devoted monks in a spirit not far removed from the fervent admiration of Manzoni. In the great mass of vagrant romances which was later organized by Malory in the Arthurian cycle of Christian tales set in Christian lands, we are on firm Catholic ground. The story of the Grail is the allegory

of the Mass. It is the reflection, this tale, of that great medieval Faith which raised huge cathedrals and transfigured humble hermits, which kindled the imaginations of unimagina-tive men. "There were none hermits in these days but that they had been men of worship and of prowess; and those hermits held great household, and refreshed people that were in distress." Every knight fasted, heard Mass, received Com-munion, confessed, did penance, and made him clean of his life, that prayer and deed might be acceptable unto God. Sir Perceval "saw his sword lie on the ground naked, in whose pommel was a red cross and the sign of the crucifix therein, and he bethought him of his knighthood," and resisted tempta-tion. The days of the year were reckoned from Christmas, Candlemas, Easter, Whitsuntide, Michaelmas, and the Feast of the Assumption; the Pope it is to whom the wicked knight is sent to receive penance for foul deeds; "those which at Pente-cost at the high feast took upon them to go in quest of the Sangreal without confession; they might not enter into the meadow of humility and patience."⁴

It is extremely fortunate that for the years at the end of the fourteenth century and the beginning of the fifteenth we have such a large amount of thought committed to the written word. These were troublous times: there was the struggle over the succession, the Peasant's Rising, the agitation concerning the Lollards, the preachings of Wiclif and the sermons at Paul's Cross by men who in England, no less than the Cathari and the Paterini in the Italy of St. Francis, were the Puritans of the Middle Ages. And of all these things our records of social conditions and social change are remarkably complete. In the Church there were as wide gaps between the various strata of ecclesiastics and as vigorous rivalry between them, too, as between the other classes of people. Yet, the habit of social satire as a means of social differentiation in literature resulted in the placing of emphasis on the bad priests rather than on the good, and the desire for reform resulted in the elaboration of evils out of all due proportion to their existence alongside of

⁴ This paragraph is adapted, supplemented, and rearranged in somewhat the same words from passages in previous papers by the present writer—"The Holy Grail", in *Ave Maria*, 16 September, 1916, and "The Priest in Fiction", in *THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW*, July, 1915.

the good. But in Chaucer, who is ever referred to as a source for social conditions, we find the sincere and the deserving priest given his proper full measure of praise :

A good man was ther of religioun,
 And was a povre Persoun of a toun ;
 But riche he was of holy thoght and werk.
 He was also a lerned man, a clerk,
 That Cristes gospel trewely wolde preche ;
 His parisshe devoutly wolde he teche.
 Benigne he was, and wonder diligent,
 And in adversitee ful pacient ;
 And swich he was y-preved ofte sythes.
 Ful looth were him to cursen for his tythes,
 But rather wolde he yeven, out of doute,
 Un-to his povre parisshe aboute
 Of his offring, and eek of his substance.
 Wyd was his parisshe, and houses fer a-sonder,
 But he ne lafte nat, for reyn ne thonder,
 In siknes nor in meschied, to visyte
 The ferreste in his parisshe, muche and lyte,
 Up-on his feet, and in his hand a staf.
 This noble ensample to his sheep he yaf,
 That first he wroghte, and afterward he taughte ;
 Out of the gospel he tho wordes caughte ;
 And this figure he added eek ther-to,
 That if gold ruste, what shal iren do ?
 For if a preest be foul, on whom we truste,
 No wonder is a lewd man to ruste ;
 And shame it is, if a preest take keep,
 A shiten shepherde and a clene sheep.
 Wel oghte a preest ensample for to yive,
 By his clenness, how that his sheep shold live
 He set nat his benefice to hyre,
 And let his sheep enconbred in the myre,
 And ran to London, un-to seynt Poules,⁵
 To seken him a chaunterie for soules,
 Or with a bretherhed to been withholde ;
 But dwelte a hoom, and kepte wel his folde,

⁵ For another reason for going to London, see Langland, *Piers Plowman* (B. Pro., 83-86) :

Persones and parisch prestes . pleynd hem to the bischop,
 That here parisshe were pore . sith the pestilence tyme,
 To have a lycence and a leue . at London to dwelle,
 And synge therefor symonye . for siluer is swete.

So that the wolf ne made it nat miscarie;
 He was a shepherde and no mercenarie.
 And though he holy were, and vertuous,
 He was to sinful man nat despitous,
 Ne of his speche daungerous ne digne,
 But in his teching discreet and benigne.
 To drawen folk to heven by fairnesse
 By good ensample, was his bisnesse:
 But it were any persone obstinat,
 What-so he were, of heigh or lowe estat,
 Him wolde he snibben sharply for the nones.
 A bettre preest, I trowe that nowher noon is.
 He waited after no pompe and reverence,
 Ne maked him a spyced conscience,
 But Cristes lore, and his apostles twelve,
 He taughte, and first he folwed it himselve.

This is certainly an adequate tribute to a good man; but its chief fault lies in the fact that its praise is so extravagant, too frequently expressed in superlatives—as if the “persoun” were not a usual type, in comparatives or negatives as if it were understood that most priests were guilty of certain faults and that this man’s main virtue lay in the fact that he avoided those errors. By saying what this “persoun” does not do, Chaucer has given some indication of the things that other priests did do. The necessity of contradiction is in itself an affirmation. And the implied affirmation is corroborated by reference in Langland’s *Vision of William Concerning Piers the Plowman* to prelates who suffer “lewde men in mysbylyue · leuen and deien”,⁶ to “here messe and here matynes · and many of here oures . . . don vndeoutlych”,⁷ and to “an heremite · vnholý of workes”.⁸ Indeed we might almost take the text out of Chaucer as a starting-point and check up his negatives by finding affirmative statements in literature and in the usual sources of historical information which will indicate the necessity of his saying that this “persoun” was different from other priests who really did exist.

⁶ (C. I., 102) “lewde” means *lay* as distinguished from cleric.

⁷ (B. Pro., 97-98.)

⁸ (B. Pro., 3) “vnholý” here means *worldly*, and not *wicked*. Cf. *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1916, p. 185, n. 5.

There were so many friars and wandering churchmen, so many privileged clergy and so many poor clerics; there were, as I have said, so many different kinds of churchmen in those days that the poor priests often mingled too freely, or rather too familiarly, with laymen of all classes. The inevitable result was the degradation of the cloth. This came about in two opposite ways, through the loss of pride and through an excess of pride. In the first, the poor clergy were often ignorant companions of ignorant people; in the second, the powerful and beneficed clergy became arrogant politicians or hangers-on in the court or manor of amusement-loving nobility.

The greatest and most lasting damage was of course done by the priests who hobnobbed with the lower classes. They were not well educated. In city and in the provinces they were forced to take to menial labor, to field work, or to be servants, and so came in too close contact with the freest-living people of a none too strait-laced age. Others frequented the taverns, played dice, or followed the rabble in the crude amusements of the time, hunting, hawking, or baiting. Says Gasquet of such priests in a slightly later period: "Thus do they spend their whole lives to extreme old age in idleness and non-religious occupations. Nor could they do otherwise, for as they are quite ignorant of good letters, how can they be expected to work at and take a pleasure in reading and study; rather throwing away these despised and neglected books, they turn to that kind of miserably and unpriestly life described above, hoping to kill time and cure their dulness by such things."⁹ This was the kind of a priest that Chaucer meant when he compared his worthy "persoun" with the unworthy, by the use of negatives. This was the kind of priest against which Langland and Wiclif inveighed. This was the kind of priest that was fair mark for social satire. This was the kind of priest whom we meet in the old ballad of *Robin Hood and the Bishop*,

⁹ F. A. Gasquet, *The Eve of the Reformation*, p. 151, based on the *Sermo Exhortatorius* of W. de Worde. Cf. *Piers Plowman* (C. IX, 188-9), "in borwes a-mong brewesters", we find hermits. Also at the tavern was "the clerke of the Church, An haywarde and an heremyte" (C. VII, 364-70). See also the old ballad of *King Cophetus and the Beggar Maid*:

"(The proverb old is come to pass,
The priest when he beings his mass,
Forgets that ever clerk he was,
He knoweth not his estate."

when Robin tied the Bishop to a tree, made him sing Mass, and "dance in his boots."

Then, there is also another type indicated in Chaucer's negatives, he who ran always to Saint Paul's in search of preference, and waited on pomp and reverence. Said Gascoyne, in the reign of Henry VII: "Jam ecclesiae et episcopatus sunt pensiones et mercedes servorum regum et dominorum mundanorum." In an age when church lands were huge, when the incomes and the power wielded by many churchmen were stupendous, when benefices were considered political plums, the line between cleric and layman was not very sharply drawn when it came to political appointments. In the play of Shakespeare, *Henry VIII*, as in actual life, Wolsey was not so much a priest as he was a statesman swimming his many summers in a sea of glory. Well might Gower complain, in the age of Wiclif, that the bishops seemed to be serving two masters, God and the world, and neither effectively,¹⁰ for we have the protests in the *Lollard Conclusions*, and the requests, that no one be permitted to hold both lay and ecclesiastical offices, for we know that William of Wykeham became Chancellor of England and Bishop of Winchester in the same month. And such had long been the custom.¹¹

This practice brought in its train all the evils of absenteeism. It has already been seen that this must work to the discredit of the Church in the eyes of the world, and it is also true that there was actual material harm done to the specific parish deserted by its over-ambitious churchman. Incompetent underlings administered affairs in the parish, while unfitted clerics of high degree went about their unpriestly business at court. As Laurence Minot, the first of the patriotic poets, says,

Bisschoppes and prelates war thare fele
That had mekill werdly wele.¹²

Nor would this situation be so bad were the prelates called away in the service of the political administration really of

¹⁰ *Vox Clamantis*, book iii; *Confessio Amantis*, Prologue, 32. See also *Piers Plowman* (B. Pro., 87-96).

¹¹ G. M. Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wiclif*, p. 19. We refer also to the life of Sir Thomas More, who in a later age got into trouble over the question of divided spiritual and temporal allegiance.

¹² From *Edward in Brabant*.

more value in the world than in the church. But too frequently, as an old proverb has it, "the greatest clerks be not the wisest men". This subject of absenteeism may perhaps be dismissed then with a final quotation from Gascoyne: ¹³

Some never or seldom reside in their cures, and he to whom a church is appropriated and who is non-resident, comes once a year to his cure, or send to the church at the end of the autumn, and having filled his purse with money and sold his tithes, departs again far away from his cure to the court where he occupies himself in money-making and pleasures. . . . O Lord God! incline the heart of the Pope, thy vicar, to remedy the evils which arise through the appropriation of churches, and by the non-residence of good curates in the same. For now in England—time draweth nigh when men will say, "Formerly there were rectors in England, and now there are ruined churches in which cultured men cannot decently live." ¹⁴

So, it is to this practice, perhaps, as much as to the economic effects of the enclosures that we might attribute some of the churches used as sheep-cotes in the time of Thomas More or of John Heywood.

It was a serious problem in which the whole welfare of the nation was involved. The priest was an essential part of the community in which he had his parish. He was active in police, judicial, and administrative work. ¹⁵ These things resulted from his superior position as an educated man; and if his work were done by incompetent substitutes, the community must suffer. He took an active part in the organization of fairs, sometimes received the rents of his lord of the manor between Matins and Mass, and even sold, exchanged or stored wool in the church. At least one such clerk discovered a business ability of such calibre that he went away and became a wandering wool merchant. In such a manner were the clergy scattered through the whole of society. It was no mere freak of chance that Marlowe and Ben Jonson, under a new regime,

¹³ Can be dated as before 1458.

¹⁴ F. A. Gasquet, *The Eve of the Reformation*, p. 127, comments on the fact of some having run away from the religious life, on the fact that the riches of the clergy led them to idle, luxurious, if not vicious lives, and on the truth of accusations in *A Treatise concerning the division between the spiritualtie and the temporaltie* by Christopher Saint-German. Says Langland (C. II, 185): "Meny chapelayns are chast . ac charite hem faileth".

¹⁵ Vinogradoff, *English Society in the Eleventh Century*, p. 274.

were able to plead benefit of clergy. It was but a token of the way in which the Church had become mixed up in political affairs that in the fourteenth century even the right of sanctuary was alternately abused and disregarded. The Church was less a religious force than a political one; the clergy were less priests than they were active members of society.¹⁶ He who taught "Cristes lore, and the apostles twelve" and did that alone, was indeed just such an exceptional priest as Chaucer had seemed to indicate by his use of laudatory superlatives and negatives in his description of the "persoun". In fact, of all the literature of the period, there is only one book in which appears the simple parish priest who stays by his duty, tends his flock, exhorts everyone to do his work according to his station in society and the will of God. There is in literature only one "persoun" besides this one of Chaucer's, and that is the one whom we see standing before us as we read the work of William Langland, "and first he folwed it himself".¹⁷

These other people, whose lives and activities have been sketchily outlined in this paper—unpleasant as the task has been—are the general average of the priests depicted throughout medieval English literature which deals primarily with social affairs. That the picture has not been entirely alluring is true: but that is because we have been dealing with social satire which stands for realism and not with the lofty idealism of Arthurian romance. In the romances, and in the lyrics, and in the miracle plays, and in the lives of the saints, the priest is depicted in only one way: as a saintly and good man who binds up wounds, gives absolution, administers the sacraments, and prays devoutly beside his lonely shrine in a lonely hermitage. It was on account of the uniformity of those pictures that they were avoided: it was on account of the vigor of the social satire that it was taken up for consideration. And it must be admitted that, as Mark Pattison says, "Satire to be popular must be exaggerated; but it must be an exaggeration of known and recognized facts. . . . Satire does not create

¹⁶ We may refer, in a later age, to Erasmus, who was, according to Pope, "the glory of the priesthood and the shame" (*Essay on Criticism*, 639).

¹⁷ In *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1916, there is an article on *Piers Plowman* regarded as a simple sermon for justice, desiring not reformation but reform.

the sentiment to which it appeals.”¹⁸ In other words, when we study Chaucer, we must be prepared to find his caricatures somewhat overdrawn and not take them for actually true portraits. But we must also remember that they had some definite basis for truth. We are then in at least a partially receptive mood and ready to take up one of the most vigorous and picturesque of these satirical attacks of the fourteenth century. The picture is one of Chaucer’s Pardoner, who will stand as a representative of the satires drawn on the wandering clergy of this period:¹⁹

With him (the sumnour) ther rood a gentil Pardoner
 Of Rouncival, his freend and his compeer,
 That straight was comen fro the court of Rome.
 Ful loud he song, “Com hider, love, to me.”
 This somnour bar to him a stif burdoun,
 Was never trompe of half so greet a soun.
 This pardoner hadde haer as yelow as wex,
 But smothe it heng, as dooth a strike of flex;
 By ounces henge his lokkes that he hadde,
 And ther-with he his shuldres over-spradde;
 But thinne it lay, by colpons oon and oon;
 But hood, for jolitee, ne wered he noon,
 For it was trussed up in his walet.
 Him thoughte, he rood al of the newe jet;
 Dischevele, save his cappe, he rood al bare.
 Swiche glaringe eyen hadde he as an hare.
 A vernicle hadde he sowed on his cappe.
 His wallet lay biforn him in his lappe,
 Bret-ful of pardoun come from Rome al hoot.
 A voys he hadde as smal as hath a goot.
 No berd hadde he, ne never sholde have,
 As smothe it was as it were late y-shave;
 I trowe he were a gelding or a mare.
 But, of his craft, fro Berwik into Ware,
 Ne was ther swich another pardoner.
 For in his male he hadde a pilwe-beer,
 Which that, he seyde, was our lady veyl:

¹⁸ Mark Pattison, “Popular View of the Clergy”, in *Essays*.

¹⁹ We must not forget, as G. L. Kittredge pointed out in *The Atlantic Monthly* for December, 1893 (vol. 72, pp. 829-833), that this is highly conventionalized social satire of the middle ages—is, in fact, “in part a reproduction of False-Semblant in *The Roman de la Rose*”, an allegorical figure.

He syede he hadde a gobet of the seyl
 That Saint Peter hadde, whan that he wente
 Up-on the see, til Jesu Crist him hente.
 He hadde a croys of latoun, ful of stones,
 And in a glas he hadde pigges bones.
 But with thise reliques, whan that he fond
 A pore person dwelling up-on lond,
 Up-on a day he gat him more moneye
 Than that the person gat in monthes tweye.
 And thus, with feyned flaterye and japes,
 He made the person and the peple his apes.
 But trewely to tellen, atte laste,
 He was in chirche a noble ecclesiaste.
 Wel coude he rede a lessoun or a storie,
 But alderbest he song an offertorie;
 Ful wel he wiste, whan that song was songe,
 He moste preche, and wel affyle his tonge,
 To win silver, as he ful wel coude;
 Therefore he song so meriely and loude.

This sort of thing is depicted in medieval literature as very near the mere sale of pardons and ecclesiastical indulgences for sins committed. It was further stated that the reason and blame for the continuance of this whole desecration, if not for its establishment, lay with the ecclesiastical authorities. As Langland remarked:

Were the bischop yblissed · and worth both his eres,
 His seel shulde nought be sent · to deceyue the peple.
 (B. Pro. 78-79)

The inevitable consequence was the decline of true faith and the placing of emphasis on mere external machinery—"ydolatrie ye soffren · in sondrye places menye"—and the men of the period who had their eyes open inveighed against the practice. As Trevelyan has said, "enough believers were found to make the sale go merrily, but the representatives of what was best in the age saw through the absurdity with as clear an eye as Luther. Not only did Wiclif wage war upon it, but Chaucer the worldly-wise man, and Langland the Catholic enthusiast." Langland thus depicted this monstrous personality: ²⁰

²⁰ *Piers Plowman* (B. Pro., 68-77), quoted for convenience from the modernized version in the King's Classics, by W. W. Skeat.

There preached, too, a pardoner, a priest, as he seemed,
 Who brought forth a bull, with the bishop's seals,
 And said he himself might absolve them all
 Of falsehood in fasting, or vows they had broken.
 The laymen believed him, and lik'd well his words,
 Came up and came kneeling, to kiss the said bull;
 He blessed them right bravely, and blinded their eyes,
 And won with his roll both their rings and their brooches.
 Thus they give up their gold for such gluttons to spend,
 And lose to loose livers their lawful gains.

Into the parish of the poor "persoun" came such men as these. They added, it is true, to the decorations of the scene, but they likewise managed to extract from the pockets of the people more or less money which should have gone into the pockets of the "povre persoun" who deserved it more than they. The Council of Trent did a good deed when, in 1562, it suppressed the pardoners. But this whole question of the wandering clergy is perhaps a little too complicated to be gone into just here. It will be discussed in the second part of this paper at greater length.

In the last analysis, the whole impression which we gain from a reading of Langland, of Chaucer, and of a number of minor references in other writers of the period is to the effect that these men saw abuses and tried to expose them. They inveighed against their ambitions, their pomp, their avarice, their worldly interest: as did Boccaccio in Italy at the same period.²¹ As Dryden says, "Yet both these poets lived in much esteem with good and holy men in orders; for the scandal which is given by particular priests reflects not upon the sacred function. Chaucer's *Monk*, his *Canon*, and his *Friar*, took not from the character of his *Good Parson*. A satirical poet is the check of the laymen on bad priests. We are only to take care that we involve not the innocent with the guilty in the same condemnation. The good cannot be too much honored, nor the bad too coarsely used, for the corruption of the best becomes the worst. When a clergyman is whipped, his gown is first taken off, by which the dignity of his order is secured."²² The words of

²¹ See the old ballad of *Kinge John and the Bishoppe*: "The king sayd the bishopp kept a better hous then hee".

²² Preface to *Fables Ancient and Modern, Translated into Verse from Homer, Ovid, Boccace, and Chaucer*: London, 1700.

Dryden apply to the whole case of the appearance of ecclesiastics in medieval literature. They will serve to end this paper.

In the next I shall take up the life of the ecclesiastics on the road and in the monasteries, the friars and the monks.

ELBRIDGE COLBY.

Minneapolis, Minn.

FREEMASONRY, STATE, AND CHURCH.

FREEMASONRY is as complex as it is elastic. Almost all shades of thought are represented therein. Not only do its three great sections, the Anglo-Saxon, the Germanic, and the Latin, differ greatly one from another, but likewise within each group there occur further and in some respects almost equally great differences of view and outlook. Consequently the chronicler who would describe the fraternity or any of its groups is obliged to eschew sweeping generalizations. His chief task is to gauge the relative prevalence of this or that view, and to discriminate between the dominant drift and the minor currents.

The dominant drift of Masonic philosophy is, as we have seen, distinctly theistic. The minor currents setting toward atheism and pantheism, the former almost entirely within the Latin section, and the latter chiefly within the Germanic, probably do not include more than five or ten per cent of the total Masonic membership of the world. Underlying these divergences, there is one bond of unity, that is, the almost universal Masonic tendency to ethical idealism.¹

Likewise in the political and ecclesiastical fields, wide differences of view prevail among Masons, as we shall see. There is however one unifying concept, that is, the tendency to individualism, showing itself in the insistence on personal liberty and in the unremittent protests against what Masonry considers despotism whether "in monarch, mob, or prelate".

¹ See article "Freemasonry's Two-hundredth Birthday", in *ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW*, June, 1917. The following abbreviations will be used: *AQC*, *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum*, Margate, England; *FR*, *The Freemason's Repository*, Providence, R. I.; *NA*, *The New Age Magazine*, Washington, D. C.; *NEC*, *New England Craftsman*, Boston, Mass.; *RMI*, *Rivista della Massoneria italiana*, Rome, Italy; *TK*, *The American Tyler-Keystone*, Ann Arbor, Mich.

THE STATE.

Broadly speaking, the political ideal of the Masonic fraternity may be summed up in the following words: self-government, freedom of worship and of speech, popular education, separation of Church and State.

"A Mason must be a peaceable Subject, never to be concerned in Plots against the State . . . But tho' a Brother is not to be countenanced in his Rebellion against the State; yet if convicted of no other Crime, his Relation to the Lodge remains indefeasible." "No quarrels about . . . Politics must be brought within the Doors of the Lodge: For . . . we are resolv'd against political Disputes, as contrary to the Peace and Welfare of the Lodge."² The second of these passages from the carefully worded Masonic Constitutions is clear enough, but the first, in all likelihood, designedly leaves plenty of elbow-room.

Anglo-Saxon Masonry. If by politics we understand party politics, the English-speaking Masonic bodies may be said to have adhered faithfully to the letter and spirit of their Constitutions' prohibition against discussing this subject in the lodge. In this sense, Anglo-Saxon Masonry has always been and is still non-political. The recent awakening of Masonic interest in concrete measures of social reform³ can, up to the present, hardly be looked upon as distinctly political activity.

If however Anglo-Saxon Masonry is neutral on points of party politics, it is far from being so on questions concerning the fundamentals of government. In this larger sphere its expressed sympathies have been in the main with the preservation and extension of constitutional rights and liberties.

In England, it is true, it took no part in the great civic reforms of the last century, such as Catholic emancipation and the abolition of slavery. In fact, its influence, if any, was on the Tory or Conservative side. This was largely due to the fact that "the fraternity there has always been in the hands of the ruling class."⁴

² *New Book of Constitutions*, etc., Dublin, 1751, 137-8, 141; cf. slightly different formulas in *Constit. of 1723*, repr. New York, 1855, 50, 54.

³ *ECCLES. REVIEW*, June, 1917, lvi, 616.

⁴ John Arthur, in *TK*, xxiii, 538-9.

Nevertheless the spirit of constitutional liberty breathes perceptibly, though quietly, through English Masonic literature. The note of aggressive militancy and indignant protest against despotism is seldom met with. But this note entered Masonry largely through the Scottish Rite, the carrier of the spirit of the French Revolution, a spirit that was looked on askance by the English nation in the last decade of the eighteenth century and the first decades of the nineteenth, the years when English Masonry was being remolded. Then too English Masonry has not been obliged to fight either for its existence or for its aims. It has never been banned or antagonized by the government or by political parties, and moreover the English people have been in safe and unthreatened possession of their fair quota of popular liberties and representation in government since before the birth of Masonry.

In its normally quiet adhesion to and enthusiasm for the principles of civic freedom, most of American Masonry resembles the English. The militant element is chiefly confined to the Scottish Rite bodies, in particular those of the Southern Jurisdiction.⁵ The somewhat greater sympathy of the American people with the French Revolutionists, the political and religious antagonism to American Masonry that followed the Morgan affair, and the growing strength of American Catholicism which many of the Scottish Rite brethren consider a menace to American institutions, would seem to account in large measure for the rousing of the fighting temper of this relatively small but active section of the American brotherhood.

American Masonry had some influence—how much it is difficult to estimate exactly—in our forefathers' struggle for independence.⁶ The American Masons of the day were divided into two bodies, the Moderns and the Ancients. The former were more inclined to espouse the cause of the Crown, the

⁵ A. Pike, *Morals and Dogma of the A. and A. S. R.*, Charleston, 1872, 1-3, 19-21, 24, 26-7, 33, 36, 93; J. D. Richardson, *Allocution of 1903*, Washington, 1903, 27, 25; Chas. T. McClenachan, *Book of the A. and A. Scottish Rite of Freemasonry*, ed. of 1905, New York, 110, 114, 393, 528; *TK*, xxiii, 338; Lobingier, in *NA*, xiii, 148; M. R. Grant, 33°, *True Principles of Freemasonry*, Meridian, Miss., 1916, pp. ix, 354; Pike, *Praelocution*, quoted *ibid.*, 269; N. F. de Clifford, *What is Freemasonry?* Chicago, 1915, 53-69 *passim*, 174.

⁶ J. F. Newton, *The Builders*, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1915, 223-6; Ludwig Keller, *Die Freimaurerei*, Leipzig-Berlin, 1914, 78-80.

latter, the cause of the Colonies.⁷ Washington was, as is well known, a Mason;⁸ so too were Franklin and at least five other signers of the Declaration of Independence.⁹ Among Revolutionary military leaders who belonged to the craft were Nathanael Greene, Richard Henry Lee, Israel Putnam, Francis Marion, Joseph Warren, Benedict Arnold, the Marquis de Lafayette, and Barons von Steuben and De Kalb.¹⁰

Since the Revolutionary period Masonry has taken no distinct active part in American political life. It did not participate in the movement for emancipating the negro. At the present time, it is a matter of common knowledge that more or less favoritism in political appointment and advancement is shown by Masons to Masons. This evil should be looked upon as a natural though unfortunate by-product of the fraternal bond uniting the brethren. It is not officially counseled or countenanced by the fraternity, but on the other hand is not in the main very strenuously discouraged.¹¹

One other point deserves special mention. The spokesmen of the American craft lay particular stress on the necessity of maintaining free and compulsory popular education, for they consider education to be the mainstay and chief safeguard of civic and religious freedom.¹²

Germanic Masonry. The German and Scandinavian Masons, like their Anglo-Saxon confrères, taboo political discussions in the lodge, and take no active part in party politics.¹³

⁷ R. F. Gould, *Concise History of Freemasonry*, N. Y.—London, 1904, 517-21 passim; cf. also J. H. Drummond, *History of Symbolic Masonry in the U. S.*, in R. F. Gould, *History of Freemasonry*, iv, N. Y., etc., 1889, pp. 300-1; *TK*, xxvi, 247.

⁸ For data on Washington's Masonic sympathies and activities, see *Amer. Cath. Hist. Researches*, Phila., 1909, n. s., v, 32-8; ditto repr. in *TK*, xxiii, 328-9, 342-3; Julius Sachse, *Washington's Masonic Correspondence*, Phila., 1915; C. H. Callahan, *Washington the Man and the Mason*, Washington, 1913.

⁹ *TK*, xxiii, 50; A. C. Stevens, *Cyclopædia of Fraternities*, N. Y.—Paterson, 1899, 95; *FR*, 1898, xxvii, 509.

¹⁰ Stevens, l. c., 95.

¹¹ *ECCLES. REVIEW*, June, 1917, pp. 595, 615.

¹² Pike, *Morals and Dogma*, 153; McClenachan, l. c., iii, 121; Lobingier, in *NA*, xiii, 148; Grant, l. c., p. ix; De Clifford, l. c., 174; Thos. M. Stewart, *Symbolic Teaching or Masonry and its Message*, Cincinnati, 1914, 82-3; *TK*, 1910, xxv, 181; *NEC*, 1915, x, 244.

¹³ Keller, *Freimaurerei*, 139; ditto, *Geist. Grundl.*, in *NA*, 1912, xvii, 178; Findel, in *L'Acacia*, Paris, 1903, i, 230; Bischoff, *ibid.*, 461; Paul Carus, *Brief Exposition of Freemasonry*, in *Open Court*, Chicago, 1914, xxviii, 300; *Allgem. Handbuch der Freimaurerei*, 2d ed., 3 vols., Leipzig, 1863-7, ii, 5.

The German Masons give voice frequently to sentiments favoring representative government and civic and religious freedom, but appear on the whole to be reasonably content with the measure of autonomy and freedom that they and their countrymen enjoy. In this connexion, it should be recalled that the German craft, like the Scandinavian, has been under the protection and in no small degree under the control of the reigning families and ruling classes. Moreover, its membership is drawn largely from the aristocracy and from the prosperous upper middle social strata. Finally its ideal of government, if we may credit Judge Keller, one of its leading spokesmen, has ever been " ' aristocracy, conceived of, not as oligarchy indeed, but as the ' rule of the best ' " ; it has a certain distrust of and antagonism to government by the masses, which appears to be one cause also of its unfriendly attitude to Socialism.¹⁴

The German Masons, although not accepted as open allies by Bismarck, lent their sympathies and influence to the fulfilment of his ideal of a politically and religiously united Germany.¹⁵ At an earlier date, the period of the great Prussian liberal reforms begun in 1806-7, most of the leaders, von Stein, Hardenberg, Schön, Scharnhorst, and Wilhelm von Humboldt were Masons.¹⁶

Latin Masonry. In the main, Latin Masonry considers political discussion and political activity its patriotic duty. Here and there one hears a feeble voice of protest against the allegation,¹⁷ but the bulk of the Latin brethren very frankly avow their political aims,¹⁸ and the patent facts are generally

¹⁴ Keller, *Freimaurerei*, 82-3. A certain aloofness regarding the proletariat, albeit mingled with pity for their lot, is not wanting even in American Masonry, at least in Scottish Rite circles. Cf. references in ECCLES. REVIEW, June, 1917, p. 593.

¹⁵ Keller, *ibid.*, 121-2; Gruber, in *Cath. Encycl.*, ix, 781.

¹⁶ Keller, *ibid.*, 92-3, 96; ditto, *Der deutsche Neuhumanismus, Vorträge u. Aufsätze aus d. Comenius-Gesellschaft*, xx. Jahrgang, 1. Stück, Jena, 1912, 20. Cf. Martin Spahn, art. "Prussia", in *Cath. Encycl.*, xii, 526-7.

¹⁷ Gould, *Conc. Hist.*, 454; H. Gruber, *Giuseppe Mazzini Massoneria e Rivoluzione*, 2d ed., tr., Rome, 1901, 256-7; *NA*, 1912, xvii, 91; *TK*, 1911, xxvi, 17.

¹⁸ France: Hiram (pseud.) in *L'Acacia*, 1902-3, i, 8, 14-5, 177-94; Limousin, in *TK*, xxiv, 75. Belgium: Verhaegen, in *Amer. Qly. Rev. of Freemasonry*, N. Y., 1858, i, 566; Goblet d'Alviella, in *TK*, 1912, xxvii, 102. Italy: Lemmi, in Gruber, *Mazzini*, 80-1, and *ibid.*, 95-9 and *passim*. Spanish America: Rich. E. Chism, *Una contribución a la historia masónica de México*, México, 1899, 25, 28; Rafael de Rafael, *La Masonería pintada por sí misma*, Madrid, 1883, 91.

recognized by well-informed Anglo-Saxon and Germanic Masons.¹⁹

The dominant aim of the political program of the Latin Masons is professedly emancipation, as they understand emancipation. They also advocate concrete measures of social reform, many of which are very commendable. But the lion's share of the brethren's attention is devoted to the regulation of the relations between Church and State. To this last subject we shall return later.

In most of the revolutions which have marked the transition from monarchic or aristocratic autocracy to a greater or lesser real or nominal democracy in the lands where Latin Masonry obtains, the craft has lent its sympathy and aid to the revolutionary forces. It has on the whole inclined rather to peaceful than to violent methods of revolution, but has at times cast in its lot with the more turbulent factions.²⁰

Masonry participated, especially as a propagandist, in the movement that culminated in the French Revolution, although after 1791-2, when the proletariat gained the ascendancy, nearly all the French lodges closed their doors and suspended work.²¹ The society also had an active share in furthering French Republicanism during the course of the last century.²²

In Italy, Masonry was outshone by the Carbonari in the first part of the nineteenth century, but on the decline of the latter organization came again to the fore as the advocate and protagonist of Mazzini's political program.²³ In Portugal, besides acting as a propagandist of liberalism, the society also undertook the task of uniting and organizing for common and

¹⁹ Keller, *Freimaurerei*, 139; Bischoff, in *L'Acacia*, 1903, i, 462; Findel, *ibid.*, 663; Gould, *Conc. Hist.*, 454; Arthur M. Smith, in *TK*, xxiii, 196; J. G. Gibson, *ibid.*, xxiv, 11; *Resol. of Committee on Recognition of For. Gr. Lodges*, *Gr. Lodge of Missouri*, *ibid.*, 319; *FR*, xxiv, 7.

²⁰ For instance, with the Carbonari in France and Italy in the first half of the last century. Cf. A. Lebey, "Le Socialisme et la Franc-Maçonnerie", in *Revue Socialiste*, Paris, 1910, lii, 259; art. "Carbonari", in *Cath. Encycl.*

²¹ Voltaire, Mirabeau, Lafayette and Condorcet were Masons. Exact data bearing on Masonic participation in the Revolution are meager, but the main fact above stated seems to be clearly established. Cf. G. Gautherot, art. "Franc-Maçonnerie", in *Dict. apol. de la foi cath.*, Paris, 1911, fasc. vii, 103-9; Keller, *Freimaurerei*, 80-2; J. G. Findel, *History of Freemasonry*, 2d ed., tr., London, 1869, 429-30.

²² Gautherot, l. c., 110-7; Lebey, l. c., 259.

²³ Gruber, *Mazzini*, 73-5 and *passim*.

intensive action the diverse revolutionary forces which established the Republic in 1910.²⁴ It is also stated on good authority that the lodges had much to do with the overthrow of Abdul Hamid and the setting up of a constitutional form of government in Turkey.²⁵

Mexican Masonry took a prominent part after 1833 in the agitations that resulted in the proclamation of the Constitution of 1857, and since then it has been intimately associated with political affairs in the southern Republic.²⁶ The fraternity's precise influence on the other republican movements in nineteenth-century Spanish America is difficult to estimate. As a rule the lodges appear to have sprung into prominence after, rather than before, the actual breaking of the bonds with the mother-countries.²⁷ Even in the distant Philippines, the insurrection against Spanish rule is said to have been largely organized and engineered by Masons, and the peacefully inclined liberator, Rizal, was a Mason until shortly before his death.²⁸

As a general rule, in the movements since 1789 looking to the overthrow of monarchical autocracy, Masonry's part has been chiefly that of a propagandist and organizer. How far, of course, some of these movements have brought about actual rather than nominal democracy is another question.

THE CHURCH.

We shall now pass to the consideration of Masonry's attitude to Christianity, viewed first as a creed or group of creeds, and secondly as a social organism or group of organisms.

²⁴ Lorenzo, *Portugal (Cinco años de República)*, Madrid, 1915, 39-40; *Acacia* (Rome), quoted in *TK*, 1911, xxvi, 136; *NA*, 1917, xxv, 61-3; E. Hein, *Geheime Gesellschaften*, Leipzig, 1913, 65-6; Magalhães Lima, *Le Portugal libre penseur*, Lausanne, 1912, 11.

²⁵ *Bull. Internat. Bur. Mas. Affairs*, quoted in *TK*, 1910, xxv, 110; cf. also *Acacia* (Rome), quoted *ibid.*, xxvi, 136; *Freemasons' Chronicle*, quoted *ibid.*, xxiii, 226; *ibid.*, xxiii, 162, 320; xxiv, 222. Cf. also on Balkan Masonry's fight against Turkish oppression, *TK*, 1911, xxvi, 207-8, 225-6. Prussian Poland's lodges are said to have been crushed out for conspiring against German rule, *TK*, xxiii, 184. Masonry has been suppressed in Russia for so long that it is doubtful if it has had much to do with the recent revolution.

²⁶ Chism, l. c., 25, 28, 70; Hemenway, in *The Builder*, Anamosa, Iowa, i, 263.

²⁷ Hemenway, *ibid.*, 264.

²⁸ *Square and Compass*, Denver, 1907-8, xvi, 93; Lobingier, in *TK*, 1910, xxiv, 335-6; art. "Rizal", in *Cath. Encycl.*, xiii.

"The first articelle of your Charge", so ran the old operative Masons' Constitutions, "is that you shall be true to God and the holy Church. And you use noe heresie nor error to your understanding."²⁹ The speculative Masons' Constitutions introduced far-reaching changes. "We leave every Brother to Liberty of Conscience". "In antient Times the Christian Masons were charg'd to comply with the Christian Usages of each Country where they travell'd or work'd; But Masonry being found in all Nations, even of divers Religions, they are now generally charged to adhere to that Religion in which all men agree (leaving each Brother to his own particular Opinion) that is, to be good Men and true, Men of Honour and Honesty, by whatever Names, Religions, or Perswasions, they may be distinguish'd: For they all agree in the three great Articles of Noah, enough to preserve the Cement of the Lodge." "No Quarrels about . . . Religions . . . must be brought within the Doors of the Lodge; For, as Masons, we are of the oldest Catholick Religion above hinted."³⁰ The contrasts between the two Constitutions are as significant as they are obvious. Their meaning will be apparent from the historic facts of Masonry's attitude toward the positive tenets of Christianity and toward the societies called collectively the Church.

THE CHRISTIAN CREED.

Christianity's belief in a personal God and in personal immortality is shared by many other religions, and by most of the Masonic fraternity. But what view, if any, does Masonry actually take of the distinctively Christian tenets, as summarized for instance in the Apostles' Creed or in the doctrinal sections of the New Testament? A Mason is not required, apart from the exceptions to be noted below, to accept these tenets, nor on the other hand is he required, even in the non-theistic French Grand Orient, to give them up. And as a matter of fact, in Anglo-Saxon Masonry, and to a lesser extent in Germanic and even in French Masonry, many non-Catholic clergymen hold active membership.

²⁹ Wm. J. Hughan, *Masonic Sketches and Reprints*, New York, 1871, 95; cf. also 103, 178, 191, 197, 205, 211.

³⁰ *Constitutions of 1751*, 36, 137, 141; somewhat differently worded in *Constit. of 1723*, 50, 54.

Anglo-Saxon Masonry. The English-speaking Masons do not discuss religion in their lodges. Nevertheless, religion and religious tenets are over and over again touched on and discussed in addresses and orations, in allocutions and lectures, in official and unofficial periodicals and other publications. These create what might be called a Masonic religious atmosphere. And a very complex thing it is, as are most other things Masonic. The varying Masonic attitudes to positive Christian beliefs range through the whole gamut from utmost friendliness to bitter hostility.

Most English-speaking Masons have been and still are in affiliation with one or other of the Protestant churches, and the custom widely obtains of electing clergymen to the lodge chaplaincies. It is but natural, therefore, that many distinctively Christian tenets should have filtrated into the literature and symbol-interpretation of the Anglo-Saxon bodies. While the positive tinge of Protestant Evangelical teaching was more pronounced in former generations, particularly in the period from about 1750 to 1813 or even to the latter part of the last century,³¹ yet at the present day too it is evident in many ways and in many quarters. For instance, Christ is referred to at times as "our Saviour", and occasionally His Ascension and Resurrection are explicitly defended; Revelation and the Divine Inspiration of the Bible are more or less clearly asserted, as is also now and then the Resurrection of the Body.³² Only Christians may become Knights Templars, and only Trinitarian Christians, although this latter requirement is less rigidly enforced in the United States than in Canada.³³ In all lodges the Bible is found upon the altars. The

³¹ Cf., e. g., Geo. Oliver, *Golden Remains of the Early Masonic Writers*, London, 1847-50, vols. i-v passim; ditto, *The Historical Landmarks*, 2 vols., London, 1846, i, 41-2, 45 ff.; *Report of Committee of G. L. of Mass. on Relations of Freemasonry to Sectarianism*, Boston, 1871, 15-6; Newton, l. c., 214; Pound, 52-3. As late at least as 1858 the G. L. of Ohio required of candidates a belief in the "divine authenticity of the Holy Scriptures": *TK*, 1909, xxiv, 79; cf. *ibid.*, xxvi, 147; A. G. Mackey, *Symbolism of Freemasonry*, N. Y., 1869, 237-46, 326-7.

³² Mackey, *Symbolism*, passim; *Masonic Observer*, Minneapolis, April 11, 1914, xv, 1-2; *Masonic Chronicle*, Columbus, Ohio, 1901, xxi, 43; *NA*, xxi, 268; *AQC*, 1904, xvii, 62; cf. T. S. Webb, *Freemason's Monitor*, Montpelier, Vt., 1816, 34.

³³ *NA*, 1913, xviii, 259; *TK*, xxiii, 204-5; Stevens, l. c., 40; *Pacific Mason*, Seattle, 1901, vii, 135.

fraternity as such neither teaches nor questions its Divine Inspiration, but does expressly give it the place of honor and considers it the sacred guide of life.

The most common attitude of Anglo-Saxon Masonry to the Christian creed, the most common at least outside a section of the Scottish Rite, might be summed up about as follows. As Masons we believe in a personal God and in immortality. As for "further dogmas", "we assert none, we controvert none". What a man believes over and above his Masonic creed, is a matter between him and God. As Masons we respect every man's honest belief.³⁴

Other views, quite different from the foregoing one, are very commonly expressed and advocated in Masonic publications and are very widespread, particularly but not exclusively in Scottish Rite quarters. "All truths are *Truths of Period*." Catholicism, Protestantism, the ethnic religions, all were vital truths in their day. "No human being can with certainty say, in the clash and conflict of hostile faiths and creeds, what is truth, or that *he* is *surely* in possession of it." "Masonry teaches, and has preserved in their purity, the cardinal tenets of the old primitive faith," belief in God and immortality and the moral law. This is the eternal religion of humanity. All further beliefs are a temporary superstructure.³⁵ Masonry has always been "the steadfast upholder of the only two articles of faith that never were invented by man—the existence of God and the immortality of the soul!"³⁶ "The 'Doctrines' and 'Dogmas' of the various Christian denominations are entirely due to the interpretations of men."³⁷ Such views are very commonly expressed in Masonic publications and are very widespread, especially in Scottish Rite quarters.³⁸

³⁴ Expressions of this attitude are met with on all sides. Cf., e. g., Speth, quoted in *AQC*, 1899, xii, 52; *Pacific Mason*, Jan., 1901, vii, 11; *Masonic Observer*, Jan. 2, 1905, vi, 5.

³⁵ Pike, *Morals and Dogma*, 37-8, 160-1, 219; cf. in same sense McClenachan, l. c., 254, 322, 354, 427, 431.

³⁶ Newton, l. c., 179; cf. 180, 252.

³⁷ T. K., *The Great Work*, Chicago, 1907, 335; cf. 370.

³⁸ Cf., e. g., R. Pound, *Lectures on the Philosophy of Masonry*, Anamosa, Iowa, 1915, 73, 87; *TK*, xxiii, 372, 396, and xxiv, 54; *Voice of Masonry*, Chicago, 1895, xxxiii, 168; *Brotherhood*, quoted in *NA*, xvii, 311; Lobingier, in *NA*, xiii, 147; A. E. Waite, *The Secret Tradition in Freemasonry*, 2 vols., N. Y., 1911, ii, 405-7.

This common Masonic differentiation between the essentials as taught by Masonry and the non-essentials as taught by the churches seems to be the product of several concurrent causes.

(1) In this as in so many other things, Masonry is a mirror reflecting its environment, and the above differentiation is characteristic of much of Anglo-Saxon Masonry's environment.

(2) Then too the Anglo-Saxon craft has from its birth been deeply influenced by the spirit of rationalism,³⁹ the theistic rationalism which accepts God and the soul and rejects all else as undemonstrable by reason. Most Masonic writers who share this view appear to be entirely unaware that there exist scientific historical evidences for the basic tenets of Christianity.

(3) Again, creeds are closely interlocked with ecclesiastical authority, and the latter is wormwood to a large section of the fraternity, particularly in the Scottish Rite.

(4) Finally Masonic writers delve a good deal, although not with much scientific discrimination or thoroughness, into the ethnic religions and the ancient mystery cults, and finding there the well-known analogies to certain Christian tenets, such as the Trinity, the Resurrection, the Virgin Birth, and so forth, they quite leave out of count the radical differences and draw the conclusion—a conclusion sometimes quietly insinuated, sometimes expressly affirmed—that the respective Christian tenets have been taken over from paganism.⁴⁰

From considering the positive tenets of Christianity as unproven, unessential and superfluous, it is only a short step to actually attacking them as unreasonable and superstitious—a step not infrequently taken by Masonic speakers and writers. Sometimes the attack is directed against this or that article of the creed, such as the Divinity of Christ, or His Bodily Resurrection, or the Inspiration of the Bible. Here is a sample by Brother Buck, who wields the spear that knows no brother: "Protestantism would fight as strenuously and bitterly perhaps for the *dogmas* of the Immaculate Conception (!) and the special Divinity of Jesus as would Rome itself. It is in either case a

³⁹ Cf., e. g., Pike, *Morals and Dogma*, 24, 93 and passim; Richardson, *Alloc. of 1903*, 25, 27; Newton, l. c., 252, 271-5; Grant, l. c., 166, 354; *TK*, 1910, xxv, 135; *NEC*, x, 341; De Clifford, l. c., 64.

⁴⁰ Pike, *Morals and Dogma*, 575-6, 685; McClenachan, l. c., 372-4, 384; Stewart, l. c., 23-4, 90-1, 188-98; Newton, l. c., 22-3; T. K., *Great Work*, 60, 65, 67-8; C. F. Ordway, *Freemasonry and the Holy Bible*, Maquoketa, Iowa, 1898, 37-8 and passim.

relic of superstition.”⁴¹ At other times the distinctively Christian tenets are characterized collectively as “outworn dogmas,” “dilapidated dogmas,” “old dead tyrannies of Faith,” the product of narrow sectarianism. By these and a host of similar expressions, the whole body of Christian belief over and above the existence of God and the immortality of the soul is contemptuously relegated to the limbo of deceased superstitions.⁴² Curiously enough, the same writers will often on the very same page say they attack no man’s religious beliefs.

Further hostility is shown to “sectarian” and “iron” creeds, because so often in the past they have been among pagan and Christian, Catholic and Protestant, the occasion of cruel and bloody persecution, and have caused hatred and bitterness between man and man;⁴³ while Masonry, by its breadth and toleration arising from its rejection of the barriers of faith, has brought together men of various creeds and helped to eliminate sectarian rancor.⁴⁴

To sum up. From about the middle of the eighteenth century to the latter part of the nineteenth, Anglo-Saxon Masonry was decidedly tinged with Christian doctrines, and to no small degree it still is. Within the last half-century especially, indifference to all but the Masonic essentials has risen to dominant, although by no means universal, prevalence. Aggressive hostility to the traditional Christian creed is chiefly confined to a part of the Scottish Rite, particularly the bodies of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States. The main drift of the English-speaking Masonic fraternity is from positive Christian belief toward tolerant live-and-let-live indifferentism. As a Masonic writer puts it: “Masonry silently but surely discountenances rabid theology and insensibly inculcates Theism or a species of Unitarianism as a conception or creed sufficient unto salvation.”⁴⁵

⁴¹ J. D. Buck, *Genius of Freemasonry*, Chicago, 1907, 287; cf. also 105-6, 109; *Mystic Masonry*, 5th ed., Chicago, 1911, 143, 247-8, 285-8; Stewart, l. c., 173, 198; Pike, *Morals and Dogma*, 735; *NA*, xvii, 618, and xviii, 566; *TK*, xxiii, 482.

⁴² Cf., e. g., Pike, l. c., 4, 93; McClenachan, 429; Buck, l. c., p. xiii; Newton, l. c., 273-4; De Clifford, l. c., 66, 108; *TK*, xxv, 137, 338 and passim.

⁴³ Cf., e. g., *FR*, 1897, xxvii, 20; *The Builder*, 1915, i, 272; *TK*, xxiii, 469; Buck, *Myst. Mas.*, p. xxxiii; Newton, l. c., 177-8, 251; Pike, l. c., 164-7.

⁴⁴ John Arthur, in *TK*, xxiii, 539; Nys, l. c. infra, 116.

⁴⁵ John Arthur, *ibid.*

Germanic Masonry. Religious discussions are taboo in the Germanic lodges, but religion is a common topic of the members' utterances and publications.

Scandinavian Masonry is said to require of candidates a profession of belief in Christianity and even in the Divinity of Christ, and to be greatly tinged with Christianity.⁴⁶ Formerly Prussian Masonry admitted only professed Christians, but the recent tendency is to relax these requirements.⁴⁷ The Bible is retained on the Germanic lodge altars, but the Grossloge zur Sonne of Bayreuth has substituted for it a blank-paged book.⁴⁸

Germanic Masonry, especially Scandinavian and Prussian, appears to be still in large part Christian in tone and friendly to the Christian creed, but the rationalistic spirit and the tendency to outright hostility or mildly intolerant indifference are far more prevalent than in Anglo-Saxon Masonry.⁴⁹ While the rationalistic or "humanitarian" German Masons profess reverence for and loyalty to Christ and Christianity, they maintain that Christ's Kingdom meant morality and religious feeling, not dogmatism.⁵⁰

Latin Masonry. For most of Latin Masonry the only Christian creed is the Catholic creed. The Latin craft's characteristic, though not absolutely universal, attitude to positive Catholic beliefs is one of indifference merging into hostility and contempt.⁵¹ This attitude is closely bound up with the so-

⁴⁶ *TK*, xxvi, 492, and xxvii, 82; *Revue maçonnique*, quoted *ibid.*, xxiii, 269.

⁴⁷ Gould, *Conc. Hist.*, 469; Greiner, in *AQC*, 1896, ix, 73; Oliver, *Remains*, i, 150; E. Nys, *Origini glorie e fini della Massoneria*, tr., Roma, 1914, 124; Hein, l. c., 105, 112; E. Schultze, *Die Kulturaufgaben d. Freimaurerei*, Stuttgart-Berlin, 1912, 151, 153-4.

⁴⁸ Hein, l. c., 112; cf. Gould, l. c., 461.

⁴⁹ *Allgem. Handbuch*, i, 406-40 *passim*, ii, 114, 194, iii, 48; Bischoff, in *L'Acacia*, i, 362; Findel, *ibid.*, 580; Carus-Bischoff, l. c., 300-1; Schultze, l. c., 206.

⁵⁰ Otto Neumann, in *Bauhütte*, quoted in *TK*, xxvi, 468; *Preuss. Jahrbücher*, Berlin, 1900, vol. 99, pp. 29-31, 37; D. Bischoff, *Die soziale Frage im Lichte des Humanitätsgedankens*, in *Vorträge u. Aufsätze aus d. Comenius-Gesellschaft*, xvi. Jahrgang, 2. Stück, Jena, 1908, 5-6; *Allgem. Handbuch*, ii, 114; Findel, in *L'Acacia*, i, 230.

⁵¹ For a few representative expressions, cf., e. g., *L'Acacia*, i, 3, 10; E. Rebold, *General History of Free-Masonry in Europe*, tr., Cincinnati, 1868, 408-20 *passim*; *Alpina* (Switzerland) of Oct. 15, 1910, cited in *NA*, xlii, 571; Nys, l. c., 121-2; Lebey, l. c., 266; Gruber, *Mazzini*, 66, 122, 134-6; Lima, l. c., 9-11; *TK*, xxiv, 345; Vicente A. de Castro, *Liturgias de los treinta y tres grados de la verdadera Mazonería*, New Orleans, 1859, 22.

ciety's views of the Catholic Church herself, which views we shall take up more in detail later.

THE CHRISTIAN CHURCHES.

Anglo-Saxon Masonry. The prevalent attitude of Anglo-Saxon Masonry to the Protestant Churches is on the whole decidedly sympathetic and friendly. "Sectarianism", it is true, is occasionally censured for engendering religious rancor and persecution and for hindering freedom of thought,⁵² but on the other hand most Masonic writers express respect and reverence for the work of the churches and consider their own society not as a substitute for the church but as her "hand-maid" or ally.⁵³ Apart from occasional tiffs, chiefly of Lutheran origin, the representatives of the English-speaking Protestant Churches have not definitely opposed the fraternity.

The views of Catholicism that obtain in the Anglo-Saxon craft are much less uniform. We have every good reason to give full credence to the statements so frequently made by Masons that they have never heard the name of the Catholic Church mentioned in their lodges either in praise or in censure. With the private views of Masons we are of course not concerned. These views concern us only in so far as they are expressed and urged in Masonic circles and in Masonic publications. Although even thus expressed they are not, strictly speaking, the official voice of Masonry, yet they may and should be considered as Masonic and as an integral part of the Masonic atmosphere.

British Masonry has relatively little to say either *pro* or *con* about the Catholic Church,⁵⁴ and the same holds true in large measure for American Masonry outside the Scottish Rite.

⁵² "Apology for the Free and Accepted Masons", in Scott's *Pocket Companion*, 2d ed., London, 1759, 298; Pike, *Morals and Dogma*, 818; Newton, l. c., 251; TK, xxiii, 440; *The Builder*, i, 272.

⁵³ McClenachan, l. c., 427; Pound, l. c., 17; W. F. Kuhn, *A Small Basket of Chips from the Quarries*, Kansas City, 1915, 140; G. Thornburgh, *Freemasonry, When, Where, How?* Little Rock, 1914, 45; D. D. Darrah, *The A.B.C. of Freemasonry*, Bloomington, Ill., 1915, 9; T. K., *Great Work*, 69-70; FR, 1895, xxvi, 517, and 1898, xxvii, 188, 401, 574; *Pacific Mason*, 1901, vii, 11; TK, xxiv, 42, and xxvi, 177; *Amer. Qly. Rev. of Freemasonry*, N. Y., 1857, i, 284, and 1859, ii, 113-4.

⁵⁴ (London) *Freemason*, quoted in TK, 1909, xxiv, 162; TK, xxiv, 17; *Daniel O'Connell's Letter*, quoted *ibid.*, 1911, xxvi, 131. I can recall no reference at all to the Catholic Church in all the volumes of the *AQC*, the most scholarly of the English Masonic periodicals.

The respective affiliations of American Catholics and American Masons do not as a rule seriously affect their social relations. Moreover, Masons, as is well known, often contribute gladly and generously to Catholic fairs and charities. Several recent instances too are recorded where the lodges have refused to rent their halls to professional anti-Catholic lecturers.⁵⁵ From time to time also one finds the Catholic Church expressly referred to in unreservedly courteous and kindly terms by Masonic writers.⁵⁶

These and similar facts seem to indicate clearly enough that the attitude of American Masonry—of Blue and York Masonry at least—to the Catholic Church ranges normally from indifference and fair-minded tolerance to positive friendliness. That, apart from a certain irritation at the papal condemnations of Freemasonry, this is actually the case is further evidenced by the not uncommon complaints uttered by the anti-Catholic section of Masonry. "Indignation at any hostility to the Papacy . . . that is the key-note among American Grand Lodges."⁵⁷ "Freemasons themselves, for the most part, have only hazy ideas as to why" the Catholic Church opposes Masonry; they think it merely bigotry and narrowness and treat it with "contemptuous indifference."⁵⁸ "To the mass of American Masons, the quarrel with Rome is a wholly one-sided affair, a monologue of pronouncement and bull."⁵⁹ "*L'hostilité de l'église catholique romaine est d'ailleurs, ici (U. S.), purement formelle, et les Maçons ne s'en préoccupent pas.*"⁶⁰

So much for the mass of American Masons. There is however a small but militant minority, representing, perhaps at the most, ten or fifteen per cent of the American membership, which takes a very different attitude.

"Some of the leading Masonic journals in the States divide their space between legitimate Masonic matter and a

⁵⁵ *Report of Commission on Religious Prejudices*, Supr. Council, Knights of Columbus, Davenport, Iowa, 1916, 29.

⁵⁶ Cf., e. g., *TK*, 1912, xxvi, 471; *NEC*, 1915, x, 274.

⁵⁷ *TK*, 1910, xxv, 80.

⁵⁸ J. W. Norwood, in *TK*, 1912, xxvii, 76; cf. *TK*, xxiii, 202, 339, 371; Grant, l. c., p. viii.

⁵⁹ *TK*, 1909, xxiv, 162.

⁶⁰ Letter of a well-informed American Mason, in *L'Acacia*, 1903, i, 321.

crusade against Popery.”⁶¹ Of a dozen or more American periodicals to which I have access, two, the *New Age*, the official organ of the Southern Jurisdiction of the Scottish Rite, and the *American Tyler-Keystone*, the official organ of a concordant society, the Royal Order of Scotland, have been as indefatigable as they have been virulent in carrying on this crusade. Two or three of the others are less energetic, and two or three print nothing at all that savors of intolerance. Most of the others confine themselves to occasional flings at Catholicism, more frequently apropos of the official condemnations by the Church, or of attacks by Catholic editors and writers on the fraternity. About the same proportions hold good for Masonic literature other than periodicals. The anti-Catholic element has its chief focus in the Southern Jurisdiction of the Scottish Rite. Let us review the broad features of this element’s attitude.

First of all, it sympathizes with some things in Catholicism, with her rich symbolism and impressive liturgy, with her practical work of charity and relief and of moral improvement, with many of her historic achievements in carrying elementary civilization and elementary spiritual truth to barbarian and backward peoples.⁶² It renders praise too to the upright character of good Catholic citizens, and to the pure, devoted, and unselfish lives of many of the Church’s priests, religious, and prelates, past and present, and particularly of contemporary America.⁶³ It moreover rarely expands on the theme of Catholic scandals and moral iniquities of a salacious nature. Its charges are of another color. They may be summed up under the following headings.

(1) It is charged that the Catholic Church is opposed to freedom of thought and conscience. She claims divine authority to teach and govern humanity in spiritual things, and so she aims at the intellectual and spiritual enslavement of the race. In the exercise of this authority she imposes many superstitious beliefs and practices on the ignorant.⁶⁴

⁶¹ *Scottish Freemason*, quoted in *FR*, 1895, xxvi, 627.

⁶² Pike, *Praelocution*, in Grant, l. c., 269-70; *TK*, xxiii, 328; xxv, 137, 338-9; xxvi, 128, 274; *NA*, 1910, xiii, 578-9, and 1917, xxv, 20; *FR*, 1895-6, xxv, 424-5; *NEC*, 1914, x, 73.

⁶³ Pike, l. c.; *TK*, xxv, 135, 373; xxvi, 107, 153; *NA*, xiii, 578-9, and xvii, 61.

⁶⁴ Pike, *Morals and Dogma*, 1-2, 14, 23, 74, 93; Richardson, *Alloc. of 1903*,

(2) It is charged that the Catholic Church is opposed to freedom of worship. Religious toleration has never been granted by her; it has been wrested from her. She cruelly persecuted in the past; she will do it again if she gets sufficient power.⁶⁵

(3) It is charged that the Catholic Church is opposed to American public schools, the bulwarks of American civic and religious freedom. If she had her way, she would abolish the system, because she considers it "godless", and moreover she is at heart opposed to popular education for fear lest the Catholic people become enlightened and rebel against the hierarchy.⁶⁶

(4) It is charged that the Catholic Church is opposed to the separation of Church and State. American priests, particularly the "Jesuits" and the hierarchy (often spelt "heirarchy"), are by craft and coercion organizing the Catholic vote and mixing in politics, with the immediate aim of gratifying their itch for power and domination, and with the ulterior aim of bringing about union of Church and State, which would mean foreign domination, the subordination of State to Church, and the final destruction of our most cherished American institutions.⁶⁷

(5) It is charged, a little less frequently, that the Catholic Church is opposed to civic freedom and democratic government such as we have in the United States, and that "as between monarchy and democracy that church has in the past always been arrayed on the side of monarchy."⁶⁸

25, 27; T. K., *Great Work*, 62-5; Stewart, l. c., 18-9, 31; Grant, l. c., 114-5; Newton, l. c., 273; De Clifford, l. c., 46, 59-60; *FR*, 1896-7, xxvi, 70; *NA*, xiii, 576, and xix, 478; *TK*, xxiii, 61, 202, 328, 445; xxv, 135, 137, 338-9; xxvi, 65, 128; xxvii, 76.

⁶⁵ Pike, l. c., 3, 74-5; ditto, *Praeloc.*, in Grant, l. c., 269-70; Richardson, *Alloc. of 1913*, in *NA*, xix, 480; Grant, l. c., 114-5; Suter, in *TK*, xxiii, 440; *Masonic Observer*, Sept. 20, 1913, xv, 2.

⁶⁶ Pike, *Praeloc.*, l. c., 276; Richardson, *Alloc. of 1913*, in *NA*, xix, 477, 480; De Clifford, l. c. 77; *NA*, xvii, 63, and xx, 280; *TK*, xxiii, 339; xxv, 338; xxvi, 65, 128; *Masonic Observer*, l. c., and June 13, 1914, xv, 1; *TK*, 1914, xxviii, 180; cf. *TK*, 1915, xxix, 280.

⁶⁷ Richardson, *Alloc. of 1913*, in *NA*, xix, 477, 480; Geo. F. Moore, *Alloc. of Oct., 1915*, *ibid.*, xxiii, 277; *NA*, xvii, 61, 63, 603; xix, 566; *TK*, xxiii, 58, 62, 328, 338; xxiv, 162; xxv, 338; xxvi, 128, 414; *Masonic Observer*, l. c.; *The Builder*, 1915, i, 259. Robert C. Wright, however, in *TK*, xxv, 373, does not fear Catholic secular priests from American families; cf. *ibid.*, xxvi, 107.

⁶⁸ Hemenway, in *The Builder*, i, 259; Pike, *Praeloc.*, l. c., 276; *NA*, xix, 566; cf. also Pike, *Morals and Dogma*, 33.

This litany of charges is chanted again and again in tones varying from calm and determined protest to fiery and frenzied diatribe.⁶⁹ But that the promoters of this Kulturkampf are sincere in their conviction that the Catholic Church is a menace to American institutions seems abundantly clear. It is refreshing for us to recall as Americans and Catholics that the great bulk of American Masons outside the Southern Jurisdiction of the Scottish Rite and many Masons within that Jurisdiction are entirely out of sympathy with this un-American and un-Masonic crusade, and not a few are outspoken in their denunciation of it.

Germanic Masonry. The Scandinavian and the "Christian" as distinct from the "Humanitarian" German Masons appear to be on fairly good terms with at least the rationalistic wing of Lutheranism. Between orthodox Lutheranism however and the large rationalistic section of Germanic Masonry—as represented for instance by the radical "Humanitarian" Grand Lodges and the aggressive Verein deutscher Freimaurer—the mutual antipathy is strong, not to say bitter.⁷⁰ The mutual opposition between German Masonry and the Catholic Church is not less strong.⁷¹ As a general rule, the Churches are taken exception to by German Masons for their "dogmatism" and claims to divine authority, as enemies of freedom of thought, conscience, and worship, rather than as enemies of civic freedom.

Latin Masonry. Latin Masonry's almost exclusive concern is with the Catholic Church and its attitude is in the main one of open and avowed hostility and hatred. "La Franc-Maçonnerie c'est une église: la contre-église, le contre-catholique."

⁶⁹ The most extravagant and unflagging exponent of this latter school is Jirah Dewey Buck: *Mystic Masonry*, Postscript to 5th ed.; *Genius of Freemasonry*, Chicago, 1907; *TK*, xxv, 134-6, 471-2, 495-6, and xxvi, 437-9; *NA*, xvii, 401-3; xix, 574-6; xxi, 150-5.

⁷⁰ Keller, *Freimaurerei*, 118, 120, 129-30; *Die geistigen Strömungen d. Gegenwart*, 3. Aufl., *Vorträge u. Aufsätze aus d. Comenius-Gesellschaft*, xviii. Jahrg., 5. Stück, Jena, 1910, 6; *Allgem. Handbuch*, ii, 113-4; Hein, l. c., 99; Otto Neumann, in *Bauhütte*, Dec. 17, 1910, and Feb. 10, 1912, quoted in *TK*, xxv, 346, and xxvi, 468. Cf. also *Freemasonry, an Interpretation*, Columbus, O., 1912, by Martin L. Wagner, an American Lutheran pastor.

⁷¹ Raich, art. "Freimaurerei", in Wetzler u. Welte's *Kirchenlexicon*, 2d ed., Freiburg, i. B., 1886, iv, pp. 1970-90; Gruber, art. "Masonry", in *Cath. Encycl.*, ix; Keller, *Freimaurerei*, 2, 118, 128-9; *Allgem. Handbuch*, ii, 113; Neumann, l. c.; J. C. Bluntschli, *Gesammelte kleine Schriften*, Nordlingen, 1881, ii, 146; Nys, l. c., 126.

licisme, l'autre église, l'église de l'hérésie, de la libre pensée; l'église catholique étant considérée com(m)e l'église type, la première, celle du dogmatisme et de l'orthodoxie". The Catholic Church is "l'éternelle ennemie", and "la raison d'être de la nouvelle église (Freemasonry) c'était la guerre à l'église catholique intolérante et tyrannique, le but poursuivi, c'était la conquête de la liberté, dans la Franc-Maçonnerie d'abord, dans la société profane ensuite." ⁷² Liberty of thought, of conscience, of worship, of government—its enemy the Catholic Church—hence war on clericalism, bind the Church hand and foot. This is the frankly professed aim and program of practically the whole of Latin Masonry.⁷³ No language is too strong or opprobrious when describing Catholicism, no measures too stringent in checking her career, not only as an assumed political power, but as a *religious* and *spiritual* agency as well.⁷⁴ Occasionally Latin Masonry disclaims any intention of attacking the Catholic Church as a religious body, but much more commonly it frankly and unreservedly avows its purpose to be: War on "Catholicism" as well as War on "Clericalism".

CHURCH AND STATE.

The separation of Church and State is the consistently avowed politico-religious ideal of the international Masonic fraternity. In the following pages we shall review Masonry's activities in this field as well as its endeavors to exercise control over the Catholic Church by political means.

Anglo-Saxon Masonry. As actual separation of Church and State prevails largely in the British Empire and in the United States, the question has an academic rather than a practical interest for Anglo-Saxon Masons. The "crusaders" however spoken of above fear that the American *status quo*

⁷² Hiram, in *L'Acacia*, 1902, i, 3, 191 and 7 respectively.

⁷³ *Bull. Int. Bur. Mas. Intercourse*, in *TK*, xxiii, 339, and xxiv, 345; *Alpina* (Switzerland), cited in *NA*, 1910, xiii, 570-1; Nys, l. c., 6, 58, 141-2. France: *L'Acacia*, i, 9-10, 18; *TK*, xxiii, 195. Belgium: Verhaegen, in *Amer. Qly. Rev. of Freemasonry*, 1858, i, 566. Italy: *RMI*, quoted in Gruber, *Mazzini*, 80-1, 110, 117, 119, 122, 129, 139-40, 246, 250; *TK*, xxvi, 110, 231-2; *Allgem. Handbuch*, iii, 574-5; *FR*, xxiv, 7. Spain: *TK*, xxv, 484. Portugal: Lima, in *TK*, xxv, 539; ditto, *Portugal libre penseur*, 9-11. Mexico: Chism, l. c., 25, 70; *NA*, 1913, xix, 195, 271.

⁷⁴ Cf., e. g., citations above from *Alpina*, *RMI*, *NA*, and Lima.

is threatened by the machinations of the Church. Many of them confidently believe that an acute crisis is pending and that the American people will in the course of time have to use political means to check the Church's supposed scheme.⁷⁵ Some of the crusaders in fact propose either tentatively or expressly that some or all of the following measures be resorted to *hic et nunc*: Give public offices only to those who have been educated in the public schools; bar Catholics from public school boards and Catholic teachers from the schools themselves; use your votes at the polls; pass a law, like the Italian one, prohibiting priests and ministers from censuring civic institutions and laws, and disturbing the peace of families, etc.⁷⁶

Germanic Masonry. The Germanic, like the Anglo-Saxon Masons, appear on the whole to be quiescent in this field. They are heartily in accord, their spokesmen declare, with the French in the "war on clericalism", but consider that they themselves can accomplish just as much by "spiritual" means as the Latins can by political.⁷⁷ They lent their sympathies however and their aid to the Kulturkampf.⁷⁸

Latin Masonry. Ostensibly Latin Masonry has worked and is working with vigor and persistence for the separation of Church and State, but in reality the craft has in view rather the domination and control of the Church by the State, with the ulterior aim of crushing out her influence in the spiritual and religious spheres. At any rate, its idea of what separation of State and Church means would not be tolerated an instant by fair-minded Americans who live under an equitable division of civic and religious jurisdiction, nor, I think we should in justice add, by the great bulk of the American Masonic fraternity.

Here, for instance, are some of the politico-religious articles of the Constitution and laws of the Portuguese Republic, a republic established and carried on largely by the

⁷⁵ *NA*, 1914, xx, 62, 85; *TK*, xxiii, 222, and xxv, 348-9; Buck, *Genius of Free-Masonry*, passim.

⁷⁶ Geo. F. Moore, *Alloc. of Oct. 1915*, in *NA*, xxiii, 279; Grant, l. c., 170-1; De Clifford, l. c., 75, 89; *TK*, xxv, 136, 348; *NA*, xx, 62, 85, and xxi, 159.

⁷⁷ Findel, in *L'Acacia*, i, 580, 663.

⁷⁸ Keller, *Freimaurerei*, 121-2; Gruber, art. "Masonry", in *Cath. Encycl.*, ix, 781; Bluntschli, l. c., 234-5.

Portuguese Masons, as competent authorities, Masonic and non-Masonic, agree.⁷⁹

Ministers of religion shall have no part in the parochial lay corporations or associations in charge of temporal affairs. A minister of religion who criticizes or attacks any of the acts of a public authority or the form of government or the laws of the Republic or any of the provisions of the present law will be punishable by law. Church property shall belong to the State, but shall be loaned to the Church. The wearing of the clerical habit outside of the churches and ceremonies is prohibited. It is also prohibited to publish in any way, by word or deed, any bulls, decrees, or communications from the Roman Curia, or prelates, or others, without explicit permission from the civil authorities. The State will have charge of naming and approving the professors in ecclesiastical seminaries for the training of priests and will determine the text-books and courses of study therein.⁸⁰

No Jesuits or other monastic orders or religious congregations shall be admitted into Portuguese territory.⁸¹ All Jesuits, whether aliens, naturalized citizens, or natives, are expelled, and all their real or personal property is confiscated. As for the members of other religious orders, if they are aliens or naturalized citizens, they are likewise to be expelled, and if they are natives, they must return to secular life, or at least may not live in community, and shall not be allowed to exercise the teaching profession or intervene in any way in education.⁸² Incidentally, one of the first acts of the Republic was the passing of the Law on Family and Marriage, which, after declaring marriage a civil contract to be entered into before the civil authorities, granted the right of absolute divorce on many grounds, among them that of mutual consent.⁸³

Practically the same politico-religious program, even to smaller details, is advocated by many other bodies of Latin Masonry, in France and Italy for instance, and in our own near

⁷⁹ Cf. references above in note 24.

⁸⁰ Lei da separação do estado das igrejas, Apr. 20, 1911, in *Collecção oficial de legislação portuguesa*, Jan.-June, 1911, Lisbon, 1915, 697-708.

⁸¹ *Constituição política da República Portuguesa*, *ibid.*, July-Dec., 1911, Lisbon, 1915, p. 1763.

⁸² Decrees of Oct. 8, 1910, and Dec. 31, 1910, *ibid.*, 1910, ii, 3, 211.

⁸³ Decrees of Nov. 3, 1910, and Dec. 25 (!), 1910, *ibid.*, 1910, ii, 61-6, 185-91.

neighbor Mexico. The Mexican Constitution of 1857 was largely the work of Masons,⁸⁴ while the more recent Constitution promulgated 5 February, 1917,⁸⁵ apparently with Masonic approval and coöperation, is in its politico-religious sections almost identical with the Portuguese — only more so! The Masons sided with Madero and against Huerta,⁸⁶ and one of the first laws passed after the fall of the latter was one permitting absolute divorce on the ground of mutual consent.⁸⁷

In general, the Latin Masonic politico-religious program has in view the strangling of assumed ecclesiastical influence in the political field, but the fraternity's chief interest is in the school, for the school of to-day is the generation of tomorrow. The ingenious legal devices for substituting rationalistic and irreligious education in place of Catholic and religious have as their object the sapping of the foundations of the *spiritual* work of "l'ennemie éternelle".

What is the attitude of the Germanic and Anglo-Saxon Masons to their Latin brethren's politico-religious activities? The Germans seem heartily to sympathize with the end in view,⁸⁸ even though they look a *little* askance at the means. Many of those of the Anglo-Saxon Masons who realize that the struggle is something far more than a campaign for the fair separation of Church and State, such as obtains in the United States, no doubt in the main deplore the Latins' activities,⁸⁹ although they do not often put themselves on record. The great majority of published expressions of opinion are commendatory of the Latin fraternity, excepting occasional disapproval of the anti-*religious* features, that is, the atheistic propaganda.⁹⁰ No doubt this approval is often

⁸⁴ Chism, l. c., 28; Tourbillon, in *NA*, xix, 195; cf. provisions of Const. of 1857 and Laws of Reform in *Cath. Encycl.*, x, 267-8.

⁸⁵ *Mexican Review*, Washington, D. C., Mar., 1917, i, 2-14; cf. excellent review of same by T. Q. Beesley, in *Cath. Educational Review*, Washington, Apr., 1917, xiii, 293-301.

⁸⁶ Tourbillon, l. c., 271, 275.

⁸⁷ *Codificación de los decretos del C. Venustiano Carranza*, México, 1915, 148, 150, 174-6.

⁸⁸ Gruber, *Mazzini*, 219-26; Findel, in *L'Acacia*, i, 580, 663.

⁸⁹ *TK*, xxiii, 62; xxiv, 319; *FR*, 1894-5, xxiv, 5-9.

⁹⁰ *TK*, xxiii, 196, 221, 397; xxiv, 474; xxv, 178-9, 230-1, 345, 462; *L'Acacia*, i, 322; *Masonic Chronicle*, 1902, xxi, 116; *The Builder*, i, 66; *Square and Compass*, 1909-10, xviii, 148; Gruber, *Mazzini*, 218-9.

based on misconception of the real issues, the struggle being regarded as purely one for religious and civic freedom and for popular education. But some of the American brethren, not many, we may believe, do understand—and nevertheless approve.

JOHN M. COOPER.

Washington, D. C.

BENEDIOT XV AND THE SEPTENARY OF THE ORDER OF PREACHERS.

ON 22 December, 1216, Pope Honorius III formally approved and confirmed the new Religious Order which had been founded nine years previously by one Dominic Gusman, a Spanish Canon of noble birth. His predecessor, Innocent III, had already given the Order his verbal approbation, and the official title it has borne ever since—The Order of Preachers. This title was confirmed by Honorius in a Bull dated 21 January, 1217.

On 22 December, 1916, the Order of Preachers celebrated the Septenary of the confirmation by the Apostolic See. A successor of Innocent and Honorius, the present reigning Pontiff, Benedict XV, himself a Dominican Tertiary, honored the Order by a Letter addressed to the new Master General, the Most Reverend Father Louis Theissling, in which he recounts the glories and activities of the Order, activities which have not lessened, glories which have not paled, throughout seven hundred years.

Seven centuries of existence are a glory in themselves, and an Order which can look back upon such a long career possesses the heartening proof that its existence has not been in vain. But when each century of the seven is quick with high resolve and noble effort, with spiritual activity, with missionary zeal that does not fall short of heroism, with intellectual energy that is the outcome of genius consecrated to God and which has left its mark forever in the world of thought, the glory is dazzling indeed. This is the glory of the Order of Preachers. There are shadows, it is true. The Order has had its full experience of vicissitude and trial, and even so

late as the beginning of the last century was considered to be "a great idea extinct." It was inevitable that such should happen to an institution which is human, even though it was inspired of God. But the shadows only serve to throw out the brightness more effectively, and the Order has never lost sight of its ideal, nor has this ideal ever ceased to actuate its members. Time and again has it quickened the Order into life and has been the all-powerful means of reform, with this noteworthy result that, while each reform has left the Order a unity, each has come from within the Order itself, a sure sign of vitality, since life has been defined as *motus ab intrinseco*.

Honorius called the disciples of St. Dominic, "pugiles Fidei et vera mundi lumina", champions of the Faith and beacon-lights of the world. He looked into the future, and the testimony of seven centuries shows that he prophesied. "How truly he spoke," says Benedict XV, "the course of events from his day to our own clearly testifies."¹

We have only to mention the stand taken by St. Dominic and his disciples against the heretics of the time, the Albigenses, the Cathari, the Patarini, to realize how Truth, not partial truth, or doctrine that was nebulous and vague, but truth in all its fulness meant everything to them. "Veritas" was chosen as the watchword of the Order, which at least one Pope has named the Order of Truth.

It not infrequently happens that, in recounting the history of Dominic's conflict with heresy, some persons are led to regard him as a ruthless and fanatical tyrant, a kind of medieval Cromwell, who invoked the sword as his chief argument, who had no consideration whatever for the opinions of his adversaries, and was the sworn enemy of independent thought. The idea is utterly false, and those who entertain it either are not aware of, or choose to ignore, the facts that Divine truth is of such paramount importance that none may tamper with it; and, secondly, the Albigensian heresy was a grave social menace which struck at the very foundations of society, as well as a most pernicious form of religious error.²

¹ "Quae quam vere dixerit, eventus rerum qui deinceps usque ad nostram memoriam acciderunt, aperte ostendunt."

² Cf. La Morale des Albigeois, La Consolamentum, ou Initiation Cathare, in

Uncompromising Dominic certainly was; ruthless, or a fanatic, never. The man who sat up all night to win his heretical host by sheer force of argument was neither a tyrant nor fanatical. He was one who had learned from the Crucified, in his vigils before the altar, the value of human souls, and who had learned further from Him who is Truth, that His truth alone can make men free. This knowledge he bequeathed to his disciples who died for the truth they preached. And if, in the words of Benedict XV, "the Church of Verona glories greatly in her glorious son, St. Peter Martyr," who wrote his *Credo* in his blood, the Order which fashioned him can count his companions in martyrdom by the thousand, men who made the supreme sacrifice for that truth of God which was dearer to them than life.

The purpose of St. Dominic in founding his Order was the salvation of souls by preaching and teaching. That a body of religious priests should set out across Europe to preach in the highways and byways, in village church and cathedral pulpit, was a novelty in the thirteenth century, and a daring one. These preachers were to unite the freedom of the apostle with the monasticism of the cloister; to bring the cloister into the busy world. The idea was severely criticized, and there were many who foretold failure. But Dominic was essentially a man of his age, with his fingers on its pulse, and he knew that new diseases must be cured by new methods. The old traditional remedies had been tried and found wanting, and Dominic deliberately set himself to defeat the heretics after their own methods. They preached to the country folk and thus spread their errors. Dominic sent his disciples to preach to them and unfold truth. The heretics made a parade of poverty. Dominic bound his sons by vow to give up all things for Christ's sake.³

Questions d'Histoire, par Jean Guiraud. Paris, Lecoffre. 1906. L'Hérésie Albigeoise au Temps d'Innocent III, in *Études de Critique et d'Histoire Religieuse*, par L'Abbé Vacandard. Paris, Gabalda. 1910. Deuxième Serie.

³ Some Catholic writers are of M. Paul Sabatier's opinion that St. Dominic copied St. Francis of Assisi in his absolute renunciation of property, goods and money. M. Jean Guiraud shows that this is not the case. St. Francis and St. Dominic were inspired to choose the law of poverty independently of each other. Cf. S. Dominique a-t-il copié S. François? in *Questions d'Histoire*, par J. Guiraud. Paris. 1906. Pp. 153-165.

The heretics had schools where young girls were nurtured in heresy. As early as 1205 Dominic established at Prouille, what we might call a convent school, where the future mothers of Languedoc received their education and religious instruction from virgins consecrated to God. It was good generalship, excellent strategy on the part of Dominic to fight and overcome the enemy on his own ground and with his own weapons.

But Dominic had a more powerful weapon than they possessed, prayer. History tells us that he frequently spent the night in prayer. History also tells us that he taught the people how to pray, and that he popularized prayer. It further tells us that he inaugurated a new style of preaching, for he made the mysteries of our Lord's life, death, and resurrection live in the minds and hearts of the people. This popularization of prayer, on these lines, the tradition of the Dominican Order calls the Rosary. In the eighteenth century and in our own day this tradition has been violently assailed. We have no intention of discussing the question; but we would insist that, despite much antagonistic criticism, the Dominican tradition, which, be it remembered, has received the sanction of the Church, remains unshaken.⁴

⁴ Father Thurston, S.J., denies that there is any such tradition anterior to Alan de la Roche, and he, according to the learned Jesuit, never appealed to any tradition in the Order which held that St. Dominic instituted the Rosary. "Never once, so far as I am aware, in Alan's numerous references to St. Dominic and the Rosary, does he profess to have acquired his knowledge from any *tradition* of the Order. On the contrary, he appeals *only* to the revelations made to the 'Sponsus novellus beatae Mariae Virginis' (i. e. himself), or to the Veracious Chronicles of Joannes de Monte and Thomas de Templo". (*Month*, March, 1901, p. 298. Italics ours.) Other critics have followed Father Thurston in making similar assertions. Now in Alan's *Apologia*, which Father Thurston calls "the most sober of all his writings", and acknowledges that "there is not the least doubt that we have the *Apologia* as he wrote it" (*ibid.*, p. 287), we find the following passage: "It is a special and peculiar duty of the Order of Friars Preachers to preach this Psalter, and this because of their profession, their name, and the custom and example of the Holy Patriarch, who, as was recently revealed to him [Alan], spent the greatest portion of his labors, his counsels, and his example in this work. This we have learned both from *tradition*, and from documents, as I have read. Idem, tum ex *traditione* accepimus, tum ex relictis scriptorum monumentis, ut legi." (Cf. Mezard, O.P. *Étude sur les Origines du Rosaire*. Paris, Gabalda. 1911. P. 296.) There was, then, in Alan's time a "tradition" regarding the Dominican origin of the Rosary, and, furthermore, Alan himself appeals to this tradition. In the face of this appeal we fail to understand how Father Thurston could have made the statement given above, or have said that Alan "appeals *only* to the revelations made to himself".

Benedict XV emphasizes this tradition when he says that: "The Church received that powerful means of defence 'against heresy and vice' which is known as the Rosary of Mary, direct from the hands of Dominic and his sons."⁵ The significance and value of these words of the Sovereign Pontiff cannot be overestimated. It is his reply to the critics who deny the Dominican origin of the Rosary. No one, we take it, will doubt that Benedict XV is fully conversant with this criticism, and fully aware of its results.⁶

The missionary spirit of St. Dominic was shared to the fullest extent by his sons, and St. Louis Bertrand, St. Vincent Ferrer, and the dauntless Las Casas who defended the Indians when his own countrymen would enslave them, are singled out by His Holiness as types of self-sacrificing zeal. The discovery of the New World opened up fresh fields for missionary activity, and the Dominicans felt that they, in a special sense, were called upon to evangelize America. Was it not from the cloisters of San Esteban in Salamanca that Columbus set sail on his voyage of discovery? When others turned against him and treated his proposals as idle dreams, did he not find staunch and sturdy friends in the Dominicans? The Commission appointed to discuss the project of Columbus held its sessions in the Priory of San Esteban. The University professors rejected the proposals, but the Dominicans, headed by Diego de Deza, gave them their whole-hearted support, and Columbus did not forget the fact. In a letter written to his son on 21 December, 1504, he says: "It is owing to him [Diego de Deza] that their Royal Highnesses now possess the Indies, and that I remained in Castille when I had determined to go elsewhere."⁷ The labors of the Preachers were blessed

⁵ ". . . profecto e manibus Dominici alumnorumque ejus, magnum illud" adversus haereses et vitia "praesidium accepit Ecclesia, quod Rosario Mariali continetur".

⁶ It is surprising as it is regrettable that, in the Collection of the *Great Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII*, edited by Father Wynne, S.J., and published by Benziger, not a single Encyclical on the Rosary is included. Leo XIII was the Pope of the Rosary in modern times, and issued an Encyclical on the Rosary of Mary almost each year of his long pontificate.

⁷ ". . . El que fué causa que Sus Altezas hobiésen las Indias, y que yo quedase en Castilla, que ya estaba yo de camino para fuerar." Cf. *Les Dominicains et la Découverte de l'Amérique*, by Père Mandonnet, O.P. Paris, 1893. Pp. 150-151.

by God, and the first Saint given by America to the Church was a daughter of St. Dominic, "the fragrant Rose of Lima".

Now, when Dominic sent forth his Preachers he never intended that they should be mere revivalists, preachers who appealed to the emotions only. From the beginning he insisted that, while they should be men of prayer trained in the school of the Cross, they should also be men of learning who had been trained in the schools of the Church. The first houses of the Order were established in the University Cities of Europe. The Dominicans attended the lectures and thus came into contact with University men and obtained an insight into University life, with the result that the first postulants to the Order came from the ranks of the students and professors. But even within the cloister Dominican organization made study an essential part of the daily life. Amongst the Friars Preachers study took the place of the manual labor which figures so largely in the rules of the old Monastic Orders; then, in God's good time, the Preachers were at work for the salvation of souls by teaching from University chairs.

The world has heard of Albert the Great, theologian, philosopher, scientist, mathematician, and architect, whose lectures in Paris drew such crowds of students that no hall was large enough to hold them, and he was compelled to lecture in the open. Yet Albert's fame is eclipsed by that of his disciple and fellow-religious, Thomas of Aquino, who "baptized" Aristotle, systematized theology, and pressed all science into its service as handmaidens round the throne of their Queen.

St. Thomas is the "laus et gloria Praedicatorum Ordinis"—the pride and glory of the Order of Preachers, as we read in his Office. He is also *the* Theologian of the Church, since, as a learned Jesuit puts it, St. Thomas is Theology. No theologian has shaped theological thought as the Angelic Doctor has shaped it, and it is no exaggeration to state that to no single teacher is the science of theology so greatly indebted. The *Summa Theologica* is the Church's text-book, as it is the quarry from which her ablest defenders have hewn their most powerful arguments. The Sovereign Pontiffs have insisted that the teaching of St. Thomas shall be strictly adhered to by all Catholic professors of theology and philosophy. Leo XIII was uncompromising in his insistence; Pius X and Bene-



dict XV have repeated the injunctions of their illustrious predecessor.

The teaching of St. Thomas is simple yet profound, and being profound it requires to be explained, interpreted, and made capable of being assimilated by intelligences less keen and robust than his own. The Order of Preachers has ever insisted that it possessed the secret of the Master, that it held to the true, traditional interpretation of the Master's doctrine. Why should it not be so, since Thomas of Aquino "*caro noster et frater noster est*"? Other theologians, however, thought differently. They declared that upon certain questions Dominican theologians had misinterpreted or misunderstood the Angel of the Schools, and had forsaken him to follow lesser lights. And now the Supreme Doctor of the Church makes answer: "Praise must be given to the Order not merely because it nurtured the Angelical Doctor, but because it has never deviated from his doctrine, no, not even by a hair's breadth."⁸ Any comment upon these words of His Holiness would be out of place. They are the supreme vindication of the loyalty of the Order of Preachers to the teaching of its greatest master.

We say its greatest master advisedly, for the Order has been prolific in great theologians, and it is worthy of remark that, in the long list of Dominican *Beati*, the majority of them were renowned for learning. St. Antonino, the gentle Archbishop of Florence was known as "*Antoninus Consiliorum*", and was called by his contemporaries "*Alter Aquinas*." What St. Thomas did for theology, St. Raymund of Penafort did for Canon Law. He systematized and codified it. And Hugh of Santo Chiaro was the leader of that band of Dominican Biblical scholars who undertook the compilation of the first Biblical concordance. The study of the Sacred Scriptures has ever been fostered in the Order, and the *École Biblique* at Jerusalem, with its group of world-famed professors, is the modern outcome of Dominican legislation in regard to the study of the Bible which goes back through seven centuries.

⁸ "*Atque huic Ordini laudi dandum est non tam quod Angelicum Doctorem aluerit, quam quod numquam postea, ne latum quidem unguem, ab ejus disciplina discesserit.*"

A third point upon which Benedict XV dwells is the loyalty of the Order to the Holy See. "We cannot be silent with reference to the fact that, when the stubborn power of Cæsar was in conflict with pontifical authority, other Orders, and especially this Order, because of its loyalty to the Pontiff, had to suffer indignity. As often as there was need to uphold or explain the rights of the Roman Pontiffs, the Dominicans in the first place were ever their champions and defenders. And so long as the memory of Catherine of Siena shall be held in benediction will the exceptional attachment of the Dominican Order to the Apostolic See be sufficiently evident."⁹

As St. Thomas is the type of the Dominican theologian, and St. Raymund the type of the Dominican canonist; as St. Vincent Ferrer and St. Louis Bertrand, to mention only canonized Saints, are examples of Dominican missionary activity, so do we find the loyalty of the Order to the Holy See typified by St. Catherine of Siena and St. John of Gorcum. St. Catherine strove, and we know with what success, to put an end to what has been called the "Babylonian Captivity" of the Roman Pontiffs. St. John of Gorcum gave his life in defence of their Primacy. Some, it may be, will say that Savonarola was antagonistic to the Papacy because of his attitude toward Alexander VI. But it was precisely because he held that See in such high reverence that he so strongly upbraided him who dishonored it: yet strong though his language was, it was not more fierce than that of St. Catherine of Siena, Patroness of Rome.

And the Holy See has never been unmindful of the loyalty of the Order toward it. Four Popes, one of whom is the last canonized Pope, while two others have been beatified, were chosen from the Order of Preachers. "From its ranks," says Benedict XV, "the Roman Pontiffs have often drawn those they desired to place in positions of highest dignity, and to whom they might entrust matters of the gravest importance.

⁹ "Etenim, cum Pontificia potestas Cesareae potestatis contumacia impugnaretur, silentio praetereundum non est, tum alios, tum hos sodales in primis, quia Pontifici fidelissime studerent, indigna perpressos esse; quotiescumque autem de tuendis aut illustrandis Pontificatus Romani iuribus ageretur Dominicanos in primis semper fuisse qui ea defenderent aut illustrarent. Caeterum, dum Catharinae Senensis memoria in benedictione erit, satis Dominicanæ familiae cum Apostolica Sede singularis necessitudo constabit."

And certain offices, instituted for the custody of the Faith, they have assigned forever to this Order as if in commendation of its irreproachable discipline and doctrine.”¹⁰

It may be that some will think we have been too laudatory, too lavish of praise. Yet may a child not speak the praises of his mother? And would His Holiness have set the example if there were not cause for praise? The seven-hundredth anniversary has brought many consolations to the Preachers, many expressions of good will which are most precious, and which shall ever be remembered with gratitude. But the noble words of Pope Benedict XV shall be treasured as the most precious earthly consolation the Order has received, not simply because they come from the Supreme Pontiff but because they are the testimony of Peter to a threefold loyalty of the Order: loyalty to the tradition of the origin of the Rosary of Mary, loyalty to the true teaching of the Angel of the Schools, and loyalty to the See of Peter and to Peter's successors, the Fishermen of Rome.

STANISLAUS M. HOGAN, O.P.

North Adelaide, Australia.

¹⁰ “Inde enim Romani Pontifices saepe quaesivere, quos vel in amplissimis dignitatum gradibus constituerunt, et quibus munera vel gravissima mandarent. Ac certa quaedam officia quae in Fidei tutelam constituta sunt, huic Ordini, quasi ad commendandam disciplinae ejus doctrinaeque integritatem, in perpetuum attribuerunt.”



Analecta.

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII.

DECRETUM.

INDULGENTIA PARTIALIS TRIBUITUR RENOVANTIBUS PROPOSITUM CUIUSCUMQUE MORTIS GENERIS SUSCIPIENDI.

Die 16 novembris 1916.

SSmus D. N. D. Benedictus, div. Prov. Pp. XV, in Audientia R. P. D. Adessori S. Officii impertita, universis christifidelibus qui, postquam sacram Communionem rite sumpserint, sequentem actum, iam a s. m. Pio Pp. X, die 9 martii 1904, plenaria indulgentia pro articulo mortis ditatum, renovaverint: "Domine Deus meus, iam nunc quodcumque mortis genus, prout tibi placuerit, cum omnibus suis angoribus, poenis ac doloribus, de manu tua aequo ac libenti animo suscipio", indulgentiam septem annorum totidemque quadragenarum, defunctis quoque adplicabilem, semel in mense lucrandam, benigne concessit. Praesenti in perpetuum valituro absque ulla Brevis expeditione. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *Secretarius.*

L. * S.

✠ Donatus Archiep. Ephes., *Ads. S. O.*

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS.

I.

KEARNYENSIS SEU INSULAE GRANDENSIS.

TRANSLATIONIS SEDIS EPISCOPALIS.

DECRETUM.

Recto et utili dioeceseon regimini quam maxime expedit et confert ut Episcopus in ea civitate sedem constituat, quae ceteris aliis viarum facilitate et frequentia accessum praebeat celeritatem omnibus aliis dioeceseis locis.

Quum itaque dioecesi Kearnyensi nuper regio nova attributa fuerit, intra cuius fines est civitas Insula Grandis nuncupata (*Grand Island*), quae maxima est in dioecesi, et propter viarum ferrearum copiam facilius cum omnibus dioeceseos partibus coniungitur: ideo, postulante R. P. D. Iacobo Alberto Duffy, episcopo Kearnyensi, eique suffragante ipso S. Sedis in Statibus foederatis Americae septentrionalis Delegato, ut ad maius catholicae fidei incrementum et decus, populique christiani commodum, episcopalis sedes ex minori urbe Kearnyensi (*Kearney*) ad longe maiorem ac praestantiorem, sive incolarum et catholicorum numero, sive hominum rerumque commerciis, sive denique facili viarum accessu, Insulam Grandem (*Grand Island*) nuncupatam transferretur; Sanctissimus D. N. Benedictus PP. XV, de consulto huius S. Congregationis Consistorialis, omnibusque mature perpensis, oblatis sibi precibus benigne annuendum censuit.

Quare, suppleto, quatenus opus sit, quorum intersit aut suo interesse praesumant consensu, et suppressis atque extinctis civitatis episcopalis Kearnyensis statu et conditione, iuribusque ac privilegiis demptis, cathedralitatis titulo seu causa, huic civitati tributis ac spectantibus; de apostolicae potestatis plenitudine oppidum Insulam Grandem in civitatem episcopalem dioecesis, olim Kearnyensis, nunc vero Insulae Grandis denominandae, erexit atque constituit, cum iisdem prorsus iuribus, privilegiis, honoribus et praerogativis, quibus civitas Kearnyensis ceteraeque in America septentrionali episcopali sede insignitae fruuntur et gaudent.

Ecclesiam vero, honori S. Mariae in eadem civitate Insulae Grandis sacram, in cathedralem ipsius dioecesis Insulae Grandis

erigere Sanctitas Sua dignata est, in eaque sedem et dignitatem episcopalem constituere cum omnibus iuribus, privilegiis, honoribus et indultis, quibus aliae in America septentrionali existentes cathedrales ecclesiae earumve Praesules, non tamen titulo oneroso vel ex peculiari indulto, fruuntur et gaudent, attributis quoque huic cathedrali ecclesiae sub invocatione S. Mariae cunctis redditibus et bonis quae ad ecclesiam cathedralem Kearnyensem tamquam cathedralem pertinebant.

Hisce super rebus eadem Beatitudo Sua praesens edi iussit consistoriale decretum, perinde valiturum ac litteras apostolicas sub plumbo.

Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumlibet, etiam speciali mentione dignis.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus S. C. Consistorialis, die 11 aprilis 1917.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, Episc. Sabinen., *Secretarius*.

L. * S.

✠ V. Sardi, Archiep. Caesarien., *Adessor*.

II.

DE SECRETO SERVANDO AB IIS, QUI DE INFORMATIONIBUS REQUIRUNTUR CIRCA PROMOVENDOS AD EPISCOPATUM.

Ad S. hanc Congregationem sequentia dubia pro solutione proposita fuerunt:

I. Num iis, qui sub secreto S. Officii de informationibus requiruntur circa personas ad episcopatum promovendas, liceat delatum sibi munus, qualibet de causa, etiam ad tutiores notitias hauriendas, aliis revelare?

II. Num, reticita commissione de qua supra, liceat ab aliis notitias requirere, quoties adsit periculum, etiam remotum, revelationis secreti?

III. Num datas informationes liceat, quacumque de causa, alteri, etiam secretissimo et intimo vel in ipsa sacramentali confessione, revelare?

IV. Quibus poenis plectatur qui talia egerit in primo, vel secundo, vel tertio casu?

V. Qui ignarus certae notitiae, eam ab alio vel aliis tutissime haurire valeat absque ullo periculo violationis secreti;

num possit ex se, absque S. Congregationis licentia, hanc personam vel has personas interrogare?

VI. Et si hoc fecerit, tenetur ne hanc personam vel has personas, a quibus notitias hausit, in suis informationibus S. Congregationi manifestare?

Et Sacra Consistorialis Congregatio, omnibus mature perpensis, ad praedicta dubia respondendum censuit:

Ad I, II et III. In omnibus his casibus non licere.

Ad IV. Excommunicatione, a quo nemo, nisi Ipse Romanus Pontifex, excluso etiam Emo Cardinali Maiori Poenitentiario, absolvere potest; aliisque poenis ferendae sententiae, quae contra violatores secreti S. Officii a iure statutae sunt.

Ad V. Posse.

Ad VI. Teneri.

Quae solutiones cum ab infrascripto Cardinali Secretario ad Summum Pontificem, in audientia diei 20 huius mensis relatae fuissent, Sanctitas Sua eas approbavit et publicari mandavit.

Romae, ex aedibus Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis, die 25 aprilis 1917.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, Episc. Sabinen., *Secretarius*.

L. * S.

✠ V. Sardi, Archiep. Caesarien., *Adessor*.

ROMAN OUBIA.

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

15 February, 1917: The Very Rev. Joseph Raphael Crimont, S.J., appointed Vicar Apostolic of Alaska.

21 March, 1917: The Right Rev. Thomas S. O'Reilly, of the Diocese of Brooklyn, made Secret Chamberlain supernumerary of the Pope.

22 March, 1917: The Right Rev. Henry M. Tappert, of the Diocese of Covington, made Domestic Prelate of the Pope.

14 April, 1917: The Right Rev. Henry William Cleary, Bishop of Auckland, made Assistant at the Pontifical Throne.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are :

S. CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE announces that a partial indulgence may be gained once a month by those who renew their resolution willingly to accept death in whatsoever form it may come.

S. CONGREGATION OF THE CONSISTORY: (1) changes the name of the Diocese of Kearney (Province of Dubuque) to the Diocese of Grand Island, and transfers the episcopal residence and cathedral to the city of Grand Island, Nebraska; and (2) answers several questions regarding the secrecy to be maintained by those who are asked for information about promotions to bishoprics.

ROMAN CURIA gives officially recent pontifical appointments.

THE CONFESSION OF DEAF-MUTES.

In a paper entitled, "Must the Educated Deaf-mute Write His Confession", and published in the January issue of *The Salesianum*, Father S. Klopfer, Instructor in Christian Doctrine at St. John's Institute for Deaf-mutes, founded forty years ago in connexion with St. Francis Seminary (*Salesianum*), holds that the educated deaf-mute is obliged to write his confession in order to insure the integrity of the sacramental act. We print the argument in full. It seems to us, however, that the demand for a written confession, even in the case of the educated deaf-mute, without discrimination, places an unwarranted burden on both penitent and confessor. The law of the Church calls for auricular confession, not so much because it is of the essence of the Sacrament, but because it assures the essential requisite of a judicial act, together with proper satisfaction and correction. In the early Church it was not so minutely insisted on as it has been during the development of pastoral theology as a science. Its value, and hence its obligation, spring from the fact that it enables the priest or confessor to act as a judge and guide. There can be no doubt that as a matter of discipline, in preparing deaf-mutes for a

proper appreciation of the value of the sacrament, and of the necessity of making a thorough examination of conscience, as well as a full statement of the sins so as to enable the confessor to form a right judgment of the penitent's state of soul, the insistence upon a written confession is of great importance. But beyond that we should account such a means as a hardship to which a penitent is not obliged if he can make his true condition of soul known to the confessor by a less exacting process of communication. Paper is easy to get, and writing may not be difficult to a penitent; but the use of both for the communication of special details of secret sins is a somewhat more difficult thing. However, the reader may judge for himself, as Fr. Klopfer states his case very clearly.

With the progress of his education he becomes the more accountable to the community and to his Creator for his actions and omissions. The exemptions which the ignorant and uneducated deaf rightly enjoy should not apply to him. The civil law makes no distinction in his favor, because he has always been able to give a good account of himself. Ignorance is never presumed in his case; it must be proved.

Moralists, however, have been led to presume ignorance because the cases referred to them concern the neglected, uneducated deaf-mute. The pastor has no difficulty with the instructed and educated deaf. No account is kept of them, while all of the other cases are on record. Hence the supposition that the deaf as a class are helpless and ignorant, to the evident detriment and spiritual loss of the intelligent deaf. In consequence the educated deaf have been enjoying an exemption unwarranted by both their intelligence and their greater spiritual need.

The intelligent deaf are bound by divine law to confess; by ecclesiastical law, the time is specified. If the confessor cannot understand the speech of the deaf penitent, or, if he cannot interpret the signs, he might take a prayer-book and pointing to the list of sins in the examination of conscience (Scavini, lib. III, No. 326, note) receive the confession of the deaf-mute. But if there should be some grievous matter not mentioned in this list, for instance, a sin entailing an "*impedimentum dirimens*" to his proximate marriage, would the deaf-mute be obliged to supplement this particular case in writing? Is the educated deaf-mute exempted from the integrity of his confession when this can be effected only by means of writing?

Ballerini (Vol. II, p. 388, 2 note) frankly admits that this question is debatable, stating that a series of authorities pro and con can

be adduced. He adds, significantly, that everyone is inclined to accept the opinion of the authorities he happens to read. Reiffens-tuel (tom. II, art. XIV. dist. V, No. 38) mentions some of the older authorities on this question: "Quod si tamen is (mutus) scribere novit, expedit ut peccata sua in scriptis confessario exhibeat: ad quod tunc, si cæteroquin nullum subsit periculum manifestationis, eundum etiam teneri, existimant Suarez, Vasquez, Dicastillo, ac Cardinalis de Lugo, etc., quamvis non desint, qui cum Cajetano, Navarro, Ledesma, Soto, Valentia, Diana, etc., aliis non improbabili-ter oppositum defendant, absolute putantes mutum non obligari confiteri scripto, eo quod scriptura ex sui natura sit quid permanens publicum, teste Scoto in 4to, dist. 17, prope finem; nullus autem obligetur ad confessionem publicam, sed tantum ad secretam."

With Sabetti-Barrett as the text-book at the Salesianum, the prevailing notion in these parts is negative, that is, that a deaf-mute otherwise unable to make himself understood cannot be obliged to write his confession. To hold the affirmative may therefore have the appearance of attempting to impose upon the deaf-mutes a new and unwarranted obligation. This is not our purpose. It is simply to examine the reasons set forth by Sabetti-Barrett in favor of the negative opinion and to call attention to the opinion which St. Alphonsus considers "communior et probabilior."

Under "De causis ab integritate excusantibus" Sabetti-Barrett asks: Quest. 751, 7: "An muti scientes scribere teneantur scripto confiteri ad procurandum confessionis integritatem?" His answer: "Id permitti posse, nemo dubitant; monent autem theologi tunc curandum esse ut scriptum aboleatur. At si agatur de obligatione non pauci valde probabiliter negant, tum ob periculum revelationis tum quia scriptum est medium extraordinarium, quod nunquam in Ecclesia habitum est velut præscriptum, tum etiam quia talis modus confessionis de se est publicus, cum scriptura sit de se publica."

1°. "Periculum revelationis." The danger of revelation exists on the part of both, the penitent and the confessor. Oversight or neglect on the part of the confessor to destroy the written confession cannot affect the obligation of the deaf-mute to confess. On the part of the deaf-mute the danger is very remote, and moralists do not take their objection seriously. Not only do they all admit that he may write his confession, but they even suggest possible ways of preventing revelation. The sins might be written on one sheet and the number on another (Cajetan); or, the writing might be done in the presence of the confessor (Soto). Elbel strongly urges writing. Thus the argument is very much weakened. If, in addition to this, we find that the deaf pupils of our schools actually prefer writing to speech and signs, we have reason to think that the argument has no

practical value whatever. It might be otherwise, if the deaf-mutes themselves strongly objected to this practice. With a little precaution, one in proportion to the dignity and importance of the sacrament and the spiritual treasures involved, the objection can be overruled. The most practical method of "hearing" deaf-mute confessions we have ever heard of has been adopted by Father H. J. Kaufmann of Detroit. He has sheets upon which is printed an examination of conscience. These sheets are as non-committal as the pages of a prayer book. The numbers written on each sheet would only in rare instances betray the writer, if it happened to be lost. But even this danger is removed by having the confessor destroy the paper in the presence of the writer, immediately after reading it. There is not the slightest moral danger of revelation because these papers are filled out in church, immediately before confession. Father Kaufmann's sodality of deaf-mutes numbers more than one hundred, and, therefore, the reference to his method has the weight of a practical argument.

2°. "*Quia scriptura est medium extraordinarium quod nunquam in Ecclesia habitum est velut præscriptum.*"

Ordinary and extraordinary are relative terms. What may be ordinary for some, may be extraordinary for others. Speech is the ordinary means of communication among those who can hear; writing in the presence of the person to be informed is extraordinary. With the deaf, speech is the extraordinary, while writing is the ordinary, means of communication with such as are not conversant with signs or cannot conveniently understand the speech of the articulator. The deaf-mute who does not carry with him pad and pencil for immediate use is a rare exception. Even in schools for the deaf, where the teachers are able to communicate with the pupils through lip-reading and signs, the greater part of their education is imparted by means of the written word. Ergo, scriptura quoad mutos, non est medium extraordinarium.

But, is the deaf-mute obliged to use this means in the confessional? It appears that St. Thomas favors the affirmative, (pars III, quest. 9, art. 3): "*Utrum quis possit per alium vel per scriptum confiteri? Resp. In actu sacramenti ad manifestationem ordinarie assumitur ille actus quo maxime consuevimus manifestare, scilicet, proprium verbum. . . . Ad 2, In eo qui usum lingue non habet, sufficit quod per scriptum, aut per nutum, aut per interpretem confiteatur, quia non exigitur ab homine plus quam possit. . . . Sed actus confessionis est ab intra et a nobis; et ideo, quando non possumus uno modo debemus secundum quod possumus confiteri.*" Adapting these words of St. Thomas to our case, we may therefore conclude: In actu sacramenti ad manifestationem ordinarie assumitur ille actus quo maxime consueverunt muti manifestare, scilicet, scriptum verbum.

Moreover, the general practice of writing confessions by this time has some shade of "consuetudo."

3°. "Talis modus confessionis est de se publicus, cum scriptura sit de se publica."

Duns Scotus, applying the old saying *scripta manent*, states when treating the question of confessions written to an absent confessor: "Omnis scriptura ex sui natura nata est esse publica; quantumcumque enim aliquis conservet secrete apud se scriptum, tamen ex quo mittit illud vel propter nuntium vel propter illum ad quem mittitur potest publicari et semper sui natura natum est patulum cuicumque legenti loquens quod ibi continetur." (Vol. 18, p. 579, Vives, 2nd edition).

The words "omnis scriptura ex sui natura nata est esse publica" have been unduly emphasized and given absolute value, though that was not the sense attached to them by Scotus himself. He admits that a writing may be kept secret, as long as it remains in the keeping of the writer. According to him it may become public ("potest") when it leaves the hands of the writer. But private communications to a trusted friend as a rule do not become public. Moreover, confidential communications in writing containing professional secrets are protected by civil law against publicity. In our case the written confession is furthermore protected by the seal of the sacrament, so that it does not become public property even after leaving the hands of the penitent. Suarez (disp. 36, sec. 6, no. 6) maintains: "nec scriptum magis publicum instrumentum est quam vox, præsertim si cautio adhibeatur."

Therefore, the exemption from the grave obligation of integrity, when there is no other manner available to insure it than by writing the confession, on the grounds given by Sabetti-Barrett is not proved.

On the other hand, Gury (Vol. 2, quest. 503, No. 7) obliges the intelligent deaf to integrity of confession by writing, if there be no danger of revelation. This opinion, according to St. Alphonsus, is "communior et probabilior." Weighty authorities held this opinion at a time when deaf-mute education was unknown; they held it when only linen paper was made and that had to be imported; at a time when there were no "lead pencils" in the market—conditions which very much favored the negative view. To-day, however, 14,000 deaf children are under instruction; paper can be bought at a penny a square yard; writing is a common means of communication—conditions which render the fulfilment of this grave duty rather easy. Therefore the exemptions of former years should no longer apply to the educated deaf. The uneducated deaf, and such as are educated in the state schools without proper instruction in their religion, form a class by themselves and should be treated as such.

VIATICUM TO SOLDIERS IN BATTLE.

Qu. It is understood that, as a general rule, Viaticum is not to be administered except to those who are in danger of death from sickness. After reading an account of the activities of Catholic chaplains who are at the front with the forces in the present war, I am curious to know whether they administer Holy Communion to the unwounded soldiers in the form of Viaticum on the eve of battle.

Resp. There is a decree of the S. Congregation on the Discipline of the Sacraments, dated 11 February, 1915, which provides that soldiers at the front may, *servatis servandis*, be admitted to Holy Communion "per modum Viatici."¹

 REMARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE.

Qu. Last week I had a marriage case, the first of its kind in my experience. A Catholic couple who had been validly and licitly married in the Church, got a divorce through the civil courts two years ago. Now they have decided to live together again; so they procured a license and called on me, their pastor, to remarry them or, at least, legalize their union. I sent them to a justice of the peace, so that the courts would have a record of their reunion. On reflection, however, that does not seem the proper thing to do. Kindly give me your view of the case.

Resp. The case, while fortunately rare, has occurred and has been discussed in these pages.² We think that, in cases of this kind, the pastor should, if necessary, instruct the parties so that, when they go before the civil magistrate to renew their consent, they may understand what it is they are doing. Scandal may, of course, be given by the incident. The original scandal, however, was in securing a divorce, and the present procedure may be viewed as an attempt to repair that scandal. The simplest solution, of course, would be to secure an annulment of the divorce decree if it is possible to obtain one.

 ALTAR BOYS' SURPLICES.

Qu. Is it according to the rubrics to have altar boys wear lace surplices? It seems to me that we are in danger of forgetting in this

¹ See ECCLES. REVIEW, May, 1915, page 586.

² See REVIEW, December, 1915, page 704.

matter the dignity and gravity that ought to characterize the sanctuary.

Resp. The rubrics require that the minister or server at Mass wear a cassock and surplice, exception being made by decree of the S. Congregation of Rites in favor of lay brothers in certain religious orders, who are not obliged to wear the surplice. There is no specific regulation in regard to the material of which the surplice is made. Rubricists, however, such as Van der Stappen, Martinucci, and Wapelhorst, while they tolerate the use of lace as an "ornament" of the surplice, contend that, when the rubrics speak of the surplice they mean a linen surplice and not a vestment made entirely of lace. The surplice is in fact an abbreviated alb, and the rubrics explicitly provide that the alb must be made of linen. We are in perfect accord with the concluding remarks of our correspondent. As far back as 1893 the REVIEW, under the caption of "Altar Boys Dressed as Miniature Prelates", quoted the following decree of the S. Congregation of Rites: "Dubium: An praeter vestes liturgicas quae competunt vel conceduntur clericis, scilicet vestem talarem nigram vel rubram, superpelliceum seu cottam . . . liceat istis pueris qui clericos supplent, induere alia vestimenta liturgica, videlicet albam pro superpelliceo, cingulum, birettum rubrum . . . chirotecas? Resp. Negative."¹

THE LITANY IN LATIN ON ROGATION DAYS.

Qu. When the Litany is read on St. Mark's Day, as advised by the Ordo, before Mass, should it be read in Latin?

Resp. The Litany of the Saints forms an integral part of the liturgical Office for the Feast of St. Mark and Rogation Days. As such, it should, like the rest of the Office, be recited in Latin, and this seems to be the meaning of several decrees of the S. Congregation of Rites on this matter. The recitation of the Litanies as a devotional exercise is an entirely different matter, and there is nothing to be said against the public recitation of the Litanies in English, if it is understood that the priest who recites them in English does not thereby

¹ S. C., 9 July, 1859. See REVIEW, December, 1893, pp. 455, 456.

discharge his obligation in regard to that portion of the Office of the day.

THE STOLE WORN DURING THE WAY OF THE CROSS.

Qu. Should a priest who is "giving" the Way of the Cross wear a stole? I cannot find any definite statement on the matter.

Resp. There is no definite instruction on this point. There is, however, a *monitum* of the S. Congregation of Indulgences which recommends that, for the sake of uniformity, the Way of the Cross should be conducted in public "according to the customs which have hitherto prevailed in the convents of the Friars Minor". It is customary in the Franciscan churches for the priest who conducts the Way of the Cross for the general public to wear the surplice and stole.

CONFESSIONS IN SACRISTY.

Qu. Is there a general law of the Church here in the United States prohibiting a priest from hearing confessions in the sacristy, with the door closed?

Resp. In the United States, as elsewhere, the rubrics of the Roman Ritual provide: "I. In Ecclesia, non autem in privatis aedibus, confessiones audiat, nisi ex causa rationabili.¹ II. Habeat in Ecclesia sedem confessionalem, in qua sacras confessiones excipiat: qua sedes patenti, conspicuo, et apto ecclesiae loco posita, crate perforata . . . sit instructa."² By way of exception, deaf persons, persons who are unable to kneel in the confessional, etc. may be heard in the sacristy, there being in those cases a "rationabilis causa."

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS.

"How should we make the Sign of the Cross?" was answered in our Catechism as follows: "By placing the right hand on the forehead, then on the breast, then on the left and right shoulders, and saying at the same time 'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen'".

¹ Rit. Rom., Tit. III, Cap. I, n. 7.

² Ibid., n. 8.

This instruction, experience has proved, is open to various interpretations. Bishops have found in visiting their flocks that a difference of practice exists among congregations of different original nationalities. We have, therefore, by request, reopened a question already discussed in these pages.¹

Dr. Byrne in his *Catholic Doctrine of Faith and Morals* (Boston, 1892, p. 330) tells us, "The Sign of the Cross is made in two ways. The faithful make the Sign of the Cross on the forehead, lips, and breast to signify that they have faith in Christ Crucified, confess Him with their mouths, and love Him with their hearts. The more usual way of making the Sign of the Cross is to carry the right hand from the forehead to the breast and then from the left to the right shoulder, saying at the same time 'In the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen'." This practice was already traditional in the Church in the time of Tertullian."

It is not a question of the "small cross", as it is called, made on the forehead, lips, and breast, or of other traditional methods,² but of the "large cross", the more usual way, as Dr. Byrne calls it. How should the words be divided; with what precise point of the action should they synchronize? Should the word "Holy" be pronounced with the hand on the left shoulder, the word "Ghost" with the hand on the right shoulder, and the word "Amen" with both hands joined? Or should the words "Holy Ghost" be pronounced when the hand is on the left shoulder and the word "Amen" when the hand is on the right shoulder? Or should the words "Holy Ghost" be pronounced while the right hand is being carried from shoulder to shoulder?

The authorities available on the subject are indefinite, perhaps purposely indefinite. Manzoni, for example, in his *Spiegazione del Catechismo*, says, "We should place the right hand on the forehead, saying *In the name of the Father*, then on the breast, saying *and of the Son*, and on the left and right shoulders, saying *and of the Holy Ghost*; and we should say *Amen* with the hands joined before the breast". Martinucci, describing the Sign of the Cross, which is "the beginning of

¹ See REVIEW, Vol. XXII, [1900], p. 88.

² See *Catholic Encyclopedia*, art. "Sign of the Cross".

all sacred actions", has the following: "Signum Crucis hoc modo peragitur. Apposita manu sinistra paulum infra pectus, et ejus palma aperta et extensa ad pectus conversa, elevabitur manus dextera itidem aperta, et extremis tribus digitis, indice, medio et annulari, tangetur leviter, frons, dum dicitur *In nomine Patris*; hinc demissa manus dextera ad pectus, pari modo ipsum tangat dum dicitur *et Filii*; transferetur eadem manus prius ad humerum sinistrum deinde ad dexterum similiter tangendum et proferantur verba *et Spiritus Sancti*; ac statim juncta utraque manu, extentis et junctis pariter digitis, dicatur *Amen*." ³

Those who maintain that the words "Holy Ghost" should be pronounced while the hand is being carried from shoulder to shoulder cite two reasons for this practice. The first is that, as the Holy Ghost proceeds from Father and Son and is the bond between them,⁴ it is proper that His name be pronounced while we draw a transverse line at right angles to the points at which the Father and the Son have been named.⁵ The second reason is that the word *Amen* does not really belong to the Trinitarian formula, but is merely an added response. "Hence, when the celebrant, at the end of the Mass, imparts the Benediction, he does not say 'Amen' after he has completed the sign of the cross, but lets the server, in the name of the congregation, answer 'Amen', to show that they wish the blessing which the sign of the cross just made over them implies, to come upon them." ⁶

On the other hand, objection is made by those who favor saying "and of the Holy Ghost" with the hand on the left shoulder, and "Amen" with the hand on the right shoulder, that the words "Holy Ghost", being what is called in logic a two-worded term—that is, two words representing one concept or meaning—should not be divided. This objection is met if the words are not separately pronounced and accompanied by separate actions, but pronounced during the transfer of the hand from shoulder to shoulder. "The objection to 'splitting the Holy Ghost' which is sometimes heard, has no

³ *Manuale Sacrarum Cereemoniarum*, Vol. I, p. 1.

⁴ Scheeben, *Dogmatik*, I, 1019.

⁵ See Thalhoffer, *Handbuch der Katholischen Liturgik*, I, 639.

⁶ REVIEW, XXII, 89.

foundation, except in popular humor, for the mode of making the sign of the cross which we defend, clearly suggests that the Holy Ghost binds the shoulders, the symbols of human strength, by a line of benediction which is drawn from left to right."⁷

It is desirable that, even in matters which to some may appear unimportant, there be established and maintained, so far as is humanly possible, that uniformity of practice which is one of the characteristics of our liturgy, and which is a symbol of the unity of the Church in matters deeper and more essential.

BURIAL IN A PROTESTANT CEMETERY.

Qu. Some sixty years ago, Jane, a Catholic, married a Protestant before the minister of his church. Her children of the union were all brought up Protestants, but Jane remained a Catholic, somewhat nominal. Her husband has been dead for about twenty years, and she is living with a son, who married a Catholic and is now a Catholic himself. Jane is old and feeble and not likely to live long. She insists that, when she dies, her remains shall be interred beside those of her husband in the Protestant cemetery. Her pastor would like to know: 1. May he give her the Sacraments while she remains thus disposed? 2. In case her family insists on carrying out her desires, should he follow the remains to the Protestant cemetery, bless the grave, and perform the other funeral rites? It may be added that the presence of the priest publicly officiating in the Protestant cemetery would probably cause considerable scandal.

Resp. The general regulation, as laid down by the First Council of Baltimore, is that no ecclesiastical rites are permitted in case a Catholic is buried in a non-Catholic cemetery, provided, of course, there is a Catholic cemetery in the place. Nevertheless the Third Council of Baltimore intentionally modified the rigor of this regulation, "*ne acatholicorum animi ab Ecclesia alienentur,*" and provided that the interment of Catholics in non-Catholic cemeteries may, in certain cases, be allowed. Furthermore, it provided that in other cases the matter be referred to the bishop and his express permission obtained. In the case before us we think that the bishop may, and should, be consulted, and, if he grants permission, the

⁷ REVIEW, *ibid.*

services may be held in the house or in the church and the grave may be blessed. Meantime Jane should not be refused the Sacraments, provided, of course, that she has repented and made reparation, as far as she could, for the scandal given by her marriage before a Protestant minister. The local conditions must decide the Ordinary in making up his mind to grant the permission in spite of the comment that would be made on the presence of a priest at a burial in a Protestant cemetery.

RESTITUTION FOR INSURANCE FRAUD.

Qu. John, badly in need of money, sets fire to his barn and gets the insurance. To make restitution, he insures his house in the same company, and proposes to continue paying the premiums until he has refunded the amount fraudulently received, with interest. In case his house gets burnt he will not apply for the insurance money. Is such a method of making restitution allowable?

Resp. There is no doubt as to the existence of the obligation to make restitution. Speaking of life insurance, Sabetti says, "Si quod damnum societati est injuste allatum, hoc sane reparandum est". The only question is as to the manner in which John determines to make restitution. It is clear that one is allowed to make restitution privately, or, as it were, indirectly. Thus, if a grocer has cheated a customer by short weight, he may make restitution by adding to the weight in subsequent sales. The principle, however, remains, as in direct and acknowledged restitution, namely, that the whole amount of the loss must be made good. John's obligation is in the sum fraudulently received, together with interest up to date. As he cannot, apparently, pay that amount at present, his obligation is suspended, but does not lapse. When, however, he pays, let us suppose, a fifty-dollar premium on the insurance of his house, does he diminish his indebtedness by that amount? He intends it as a donation to the company, while the company considers that he gets an equivalent, namely "protection". He knows that he is not really "protected"; but, what if he should die suddenly and his heirs should, in case of fire, collect the insurance? Again, if John has a trust, or mort-

gage, on his house, does his "fictitious" insurance not clash with his obligation to the trust company? Altogether, we think that, while the principle of indirect or occult restitution remains, the procedure in this case is not to be recommended and can be tolerated only on the supposition that in this way and in this way alone can John realize his intention of making restitution in full for the injury he has done the company.

THE TABERNAOLE VEIL AGAIN.

Qu. On the occasion of the Episcopal Visitation in my parish the following different opinions were expressed:

1. It is sufficient to have a veil (white or to be changed according to the color of day) in front of the tabernacle door, and the whole inside (door, walls, floor) of the tabernacle covered or lined with white silk.¹

2. There must be a separate white silk veil on the inside of the door; or, to make it plain, there must be—the outside veil, the door covered on the inside with white silk, and an extra white veil hanging between the door and the inside.

Which of these two opinions coincides with the regulations of the Congregation of Rites?

Resp. The first opinion is, in our estimation, correct. The veil hanging between the door of the tabernacle and the interior is required only in case the door, or part of it, is transparent. O'Kane says: "If the door or sides (of the tabernacle) be of precious stone that is transparent, it must be covered with the veil in such a way that the ciborium cannot be seen." As to the sides of the tabernacle, they must either be gilt or covered with a veil; the veil inside the door is allowed, but is not prescribed unless the door be transparent. Answering a query on this point, the S. Congregation of Rites (Decree n. 2564) declares, "Ita obtegendum esse Tabernaculum ut Vas in quo Sanctissimum Sacramentum asservatur a circumstantibus nullo modo videri possit."²

¹ ECCLES. REVIEW, Vol. 56, No. 4, p. 418.

² See also REVIEW, Vol. XXIII, p. 417.

EXTENT OF INDULT TO SAY VOTIVE MASS ON ACCOUNT OF DEFECTIVE SIGHT.

Qu. A priest who enjoys, "propter defectum visivae facultatis", the privilege of celebrating the Mass of the Blessed Virgin or a Requiem Mass, would like to know whether he can also *sing* a Missa Cantata, either Votive of the Blessed Virgin, or Requiem. Also, may he, occasionally, out of devotion, say the Mass proper for the feast, for example, the Mass for the Feast of St. Joseph on 19 March? How many Masses may he say on Christmas Day?

Resp. On the last point there is an explicit decree (No. 2802, S. Congregation of Rites) which forbids him to say more than one Mass. For the rest, it is expressly declared that the conditions attached to this indult are not mere forms of the Curia, but bind in conscience. Thus we read that the indult is generally granted with the proviso that the Mass be celebrated privately. We do not think that, if he is able to read the Mass of the Feast of St. Joseph, he can, in conscience, continue to use a privilege which was granted on the understanding that he could not use the Missal. Although the principle holds good that no one is obliged to use a privilege, when the conditions attached to the privilege bind in conscience, as they do in this case, they must be observed.

LACE ON THE ALTAR.

"Was there any lace on the Cross?"

"No."

"Was there any lace in the Holy Sepulchre?"

"No."

"Was there any at the Last Supper?"

"No."

"Why, then, is it here on this altar?"

These are some of the questions asked by an old pastor, when he saw lace-trimming pinned to an altar cloth.

Some of his other statements were :

"The crucifix shows us Calvary, and the altar table the Last Supper; the linen altar cloths will not let us forget the linen about our Saviour's Body in the tomb; the lighted candles speak of the night of the First Mass, and the flowers of the guest chamber, the large dining-room which was "furnished"

(Lk. 22: 11-12) then, we presume, with flowers as dining-tables are furnished at feasts to-day."

"The olive oil in the lamp that looks down on the altar reminds us of the olive trees that witnessed Christ's agony. Everything reminds us of Christ except the lace, which reminds us only of the great love that ladies have for it. It seems impossible to persuade them that it is inappropriate on the altar. The only way to get rid of it permanently is to have *men* sacristans."

J. F. S.

ARE PRIESTS EASY VICTIMS OF PROFESSIONAL BEGGARS?

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The number of "grafters" who are making a specialty of "victimizing" priests leads one to the conclusion that we men of the cloth must be easy victims. During the past year no fewer than six of these artists attempted to play on the writer and neighboring pastors, who believed we were doing excellent work of charity. There are many readers of the REVIEW who are still in unexploited territory, and a word of warning might help them. The cases mentioned above are: a young lady "recently moved into your parish" selling Irish laces; an agent hailing from Washington, D. C., selling books at a ridiculously low price and filling only about half his contracts; a man calling himself "Tom Larkins", taking orders for a mackintosh house and "touching" priests as a side line; a German physician; and finally a farmer dressed in overalls. The last two are the smoothest liars in ten states—they can answer a hundred questions without a moment's hesitation, and every answer is a lie. The physician hails from Canada. He tells you he was suspected there of being a German spy, was arrested and imprisoned, and finally escaped into the States, leaving all his possessions behind. He made his way to Chicago, where the Medical Association told him of a splendid opening for a good physician in our town (i. e. wherever he makes his appearance). He rents a house in your parish, where his wife and two children are now living, and comes to you to have you suggest a good location for his office. His children are to start in your school the following day, and he

rents a pew in your church to be paid for as soon as he is settled. When all is arranged satisfactorily, he shows you a check for \$85.00 which he cannot cash, being a stranger, and tells you he will send it to his father in a distant state who is sure to remit cash for it. Meantime he is somewhat short of funds and wonders if you could help to tide him over a few days. Before letting him depart with your money, take a good look at it—you will never see it or the physician again.

The "overall" man works along the same lines. He has moved into a neighboring town where there is no Catholic church. He is surprised at the bigotry in that town and tells you that he, his wife, and two children are already being persecuted because of their faith. He belongs to your parish and is going to move as soon as he finds a house. His moving expenses were heavier than he looked for and left him "dead broke". He has money coming from his old employer next week, but meantime the bigoted grocer will not give him credit because he will not trust a Catholic, and the poor fellow wonders if you could do something for him. There is not a bite to eat in the house, and \$5.00 or \$6.00 would see him through until his money comes. He looks so honest and so unsophisticated and answers all your questions in so straightforward a manner that you would never suspect his story is fabricated from beginning to end. These men make many more statements and can manage to add local names and coloring to make their story more effective.

Why not secure the aid of the press to run down this class of professionals? If all priests who were duped reported the case, and if these reports were published, we would soon make the work of such crooks unprofitable enough to drive them from the field. Older pastors may not need such warning. They no doubt learned wisdom through costly experience, but just because they were victimized is no reason why the younger men should be left in ignorance to make the same mistakes others have made before them.

N. J. L.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE STORY OF THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, A Narrative of the Development of the Early Church. By Dennis Lynch, S.J.—New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1917. Pp. 295. With Illustrations.

In a simple and pleasing style, with due attention to the obvious difficulties of textual interpretation and chronological sequence, yet without overloading his narrative with critical references, Father Lynch tells the story of the thirty-three years of Apostolic labor that followed upon our Lord's Ascension. The development of the Church, attested by the inspired records of St. Luke's Acts, is in some respects the strongest proof of the divinely authorized and guided work of the Catholic Church in subsequent ages. It serves as a pattern and precedent, and thus helps to answer difficulties and charges of defection raised by the advocates of the Reformation. The gradual ordering, under the inspiration of the Pentecostal spirit, of the missionary apostolate, the recognition of the Primacy of St. Peter, the organizing of a religious life with a community of goods, the hierarchical establishment of bishops, priests, and deacons, to perform the pastoral duties, the convocation of the Councils of Jerusalem and Antioch for the regulation of Church discipline under the authority of the supreme head of the Apostolic College, and above all the wonderful career of St. Paul in his mission to the Gentiles, all these events offer analogies for the action of the living Catholic Church as the descendant and heir of the Church of Christ. Even the weakness and errors within, no less than the opposition from without, attest the likeness of the Apostolic Church in all ages, and help the sincere inquirer after truth to a recognition of the one fold in which Christ intended the followers of His teaching to gather.

Father Lynch establishes the authenticity and authorship of the Acts on the evidence of Patristic testimony and an unbroken tradition; but he does not fail to cite also the arguments of modern critics like Harnack, or sceptics like Renan, who admit the cogency of these arguments alike from the evidence of history and internal criteria.

Priests and students of Scripture, teachers of Christian doctrine, and reading Catholics in general will be benefited by the possession of this volume, offering as it does an unbiased statement of early Church history and an enlightened interpretation of the Sacred Text of the Acts of the Apostles.

THEOLOGY OF THE CULTUS OF THE SACRED HEART. A Moral, Dogmatic, and Historical Study. Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the Sacred Sciences at the Catholic University of America, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Doctorate in Theology. By the Rev. Joseph Jules Charles Petrovits, J.O.B., S.T.L., of the Diocese of Harrisburg. Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C. 1917. Pp. 228.

An academic treatise of practical value in its interpretation of a popular devotion solving real difficulties for the inquiring Catholic solicits the special attention of our clergy. Father Petrovits in surveying the literature of the cult of the Sacred Heart briefly summarises the historical origin, purpose, and meaning of the devotion. He collates the approved texts embodying the teaching of the Church, and the pertinent interpretations of theologians. In the latter he emphasizes the customary distinction between the primary and the secondary, the material and the formal objects of the cult. He dwells with sufficient succinctness on the symbolism, the created and the increated love represented in the Heart of Jesus; and thence passes over to what seems to us the distinctive feature of the dissertation, and the one which gives it a certain attestation of originality as compared with similar treatises on the same topic. This is the interpretation of the so-called "Great Promise" of the gift of final repentance with the reception of the last sacraments at the hour of death, as a special grace vouchsafed to those who practise the devotion of the nine First Fridays.

Father Petrovits examines the historical basis of this promise, and then interprets it from the words of Bishop Languet in his *Life of Blessed Margaret Mary* written in 1729. The result is that, instead of the promise enunciating an infallible declaration revealed to the Saint, we have the expression of a hope in the mercy of God. The exercise of the nine First Fridays is one "que Notre Seigneur lui avait suggérée, en lui faisant espérer la grâce de la pénitence finale, et celle de recevoir les sacrements de l'Église avant que de mourir, pour ceux qui l'observoient." This contention is well supported. One cannot at the same time but note the tone of respect and moderation with which the writer treats the opinions of those who fail to distinguish between the original writings of Blessed Margaret and the authenticated but still uncertain copies whence various conclusions might be drawn by the devout reader.

In the bibliography we find mention of the Abbé Felix Anizan's *Elevation to the Sacred Heart*. It might have added to the completion of the thesis to have noticed especially a later volume by the

same author translated into English under the title *What is the Sacred Heart?* (M. H. Gill and Son: Dublin 1914). This latter is an elaborate attempt to disprove, in theological fashion, the thesis that the object of the devotion of the Sacred Heart is in any true sense the material heart of the Man-God rather than the Person of Christ symbolized by His Heart. The thesis as proposed by Father Anizan is to our mind untenable, though he cites the approbation of men like Abbot (now Cardinal) Gasquet, and a number of French ecclesiastics. Anizan's book offers distinct material for controversy, since it appears to be a critique of the prevailing teaching of the Jesuit theologians, to whom indeed belongs the merit of having cleared up and propagated the devotion in its most approved form. Dr. Petrovits steers the middle course and adds to the popular appreciation of a cult that expresses the climax of Divine Love in Catholic worship, especially in its relation to the Eucharistic Presence.

FOURTH BIENNIAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES. Proceedings published by direction of the Executive Committee of the Conference, 17-20 September, 1916. Catholic University of America. Washington. Pp. 420.

Were the National Conference of Catholic Charities to be evaluated solely by the present report of its proceedings it would stand high in the esteem of every Catholic into whose hands the volume may fall. There are of course in its favor various other standards of estimation, but we want to emphasize the one before us as an enduring and a very clearly defined criterion. For what have we here? In the first place a systematized survey of Catholic charities. In the second place, the mature and well digested reflexions of specialists in the various departments of those charities. Let us attend for a moment to the former of these two constituents.

Since the work of organized charities has passed so generally from the hands of the Church into State, or at least secular, management, one is apt to lose sight of the wide range of Catholic beneficence and to have inadequate ideas regarding the interrelations of Catholic charities and secular philanthropies. A glance over the papers read and discussed at the Convention held in Washington last Fall and embodied in the present volume is at once encouraging and informing. The "Proceedings" are classified into those conducted by the general meetings and those of special sections. Under the former organization were considered relief work—the rôle of private and group initiative therein; of State legislation; the relation of the

Catholic Press thereto. Under the same section came the burning problem of juvenile delinquency. This was fully discussed in four special papers.

The sectional committees handled the problems centering in relief work extending (1) to the family; (2) to the child—the children in institutions and so on; (3) to the sick and defectives—backward children, the feeble-minded, nursing and kindred topics; (4) to social and civic activities—the employment problems, the minimum wage and the rest; lastly (5) the women's section, dealing with various problems relating to the care of girls and the matter of Catholic coöperation with other agencies in this function. The bare mention of these titles suffices to suggest the broad field of Catholic beneficence covered by the discussions reported in the volume. Now when it is remembered that the papers sum up and the discussions supplement the ripened thought of men and women who may be regarded as experts in their special lines of work, we can easily recognize the value of the present Report both as regards the large amount of practical wisdom which it places in the hands of our Catholic workers and for the stimulus these papers give to the onlooker, not to say the idler, to enter into the field and to a share in the works of mercy.

Besides doing this immediately practical service, the volume comes as a welcome addition to our none too copious literature of social science. Although the papers overlap at various points, there is sufficient homogeneity in the ensemble to justify its subsumption under that species of books, while the repetitions may answer a good turn by justifying the maxim *repetita juvant*. Needless to say, the book appeals in a special way to the clergy, who after all, or rather before all, must be the generals in the advance guard of human benefactors and knights of mercy.

THE NEXT STEP IN DEMOCRACY. By R. W. Sellars, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Philosophy, University of Michigan. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1916. Pp. 275.

The title of this book might well have terminated with an interrogation mark. Who can tell what is going to be the next step in Democracy? Nobody—not even the author of the present work, though he undoubtedly has devoted much thought and ability to the subject. Still, there are signs of the times which so thoughtful a mind and so alert an observer may be warranted in interpreting as he does. And in so far as that interpretation includes the forecast of an ever-extending democratization of the nations, probably most thinking men will agree with him. Inasmuch however as his prognostication contains the idea of a Socialist democracy there will undoubtedly be more to differ.

But what does Mr. Sellars conceive Socialism to be? Disregarding the labeled forms of the systematic varieties, whereof there are more than fifty-seven, he rightly looks upon Socialism as a world movement. Socialism he declares to be "a democratic movement whose purpose is the securing of an economic organization of society which will give the maximum possible, at any one time, of justice and liberty." It would hardly be fair to apply to this formula the rigid canon of logical definition. There are surely reformatory proposals other than Socialism which might justly claim the very same definition. However, one must expect a definition of so comprehensive a movement to be somewhat vague. We are not sure that Professor Sellars has succeeded in differentiating Socialism even by enumerating its hopes. "Socialism," he tells us, "hopes to reduce the disorder characteristic of the market as it is at present organized; to lessen waste; to eliminate all degrees of competition that are eminently anti-social in their consequences; to eliminate unmerited poverty; to tap new energies now latent; to make labor-saving machines really save labor; to procure a fair degree of leisure for each individual; to achieve a better distribution of business costs; finally, to bring in its wake a society healthier physically and morally and one ever more capable of developing sane and progressive institutions" (pp. 59-60).

Without a doubt these are hopes fondly to be cherished; besides, they are substantially identical with the ideals which every other organization for social betterment offers to its followers. To what degree Socialism could make good such promises is of course a matter on which the opinions of men may and do differ. Professor Sellars, however, argues bravely, if not convincingly, for the affirmative. Having justified to his satisfaction the hope that is in him, he is equally successful in dispelling certain popular misconceptions regarding Socialism. Thus he easily shows that Socialism is not anarchism, nor even syndicalism, though it welcomes certain tendencies therein; neither is it communism nor bureaucratism. Objections against Socialism are also easily met and plausibly disposed of. Thus the well worn dilemma: "Is the capitalist to be expropriated without indemnity or to be offered compensation?" is shown not to "contain an exhaustive disjunction" (p. 117). By way of illustration we have but to take the telegraph, telephone, and the railroads. Were the government to purchase these arteries of communal life, "how would it finance the operation? Probably by a sale of bonds at a competitive rate of interest and, let us hope, so far as possible at low denominations so that many could invest." But once again, is this Socialism? No, it is not, "except so far as it represents a change of attitude toward social enterprise" (ib.). And so Social-

ism shows itself to be rather a psychological affair, a mental attitude, a group or rather a racial consciousness. If anyone should be perplexed by the thought of the financial burden which the Atlas-like State would be taking upon its shoulders, as one agency of production or distribution after another were taken up, let him remember that Socialists at the present day do not advocate the nationalization of all those agencies. Such a dream of thorough-going collectivism was characteristic of old-time Socialism, which has been superseded by the advance of "genetic views," which have changed all that and have given new significance to variety, which is not simply the spice of life, but also the hope of development and progress. Mr. Sellars "sees no reason why competition should not remain open to counteract any stagnation which might otherwise set in" (p. 119).

Further topics dealt with in the volume are the ethics of labor, the growth of justice, social freedom, reflexions on the war. The possibility of universalizing democracy is also discussed with due caution and reserve. On all these subjects Mr. Sellars writes suggestively and interestingly. Indeed the book on the whole is stimulating and well worth while, embodying as it does the ideas of a cultured and a thoughtful mind on what looks like a possible, perhaps not improbably a socialistic, democracy. There are, it need hardly be said, not a few points upon which readers of this REVIEW will have to differ from the author; notably of course in regard to the assumption, dominant throughout, that education will suffice to beget or conserve a universal regard for the brotherhood of man. It is finely idealistic to speculate on a social organization wherein each shall be for all and all for each; but if experience teaches anything, it proves that the forces innate in concrete human nature will never bring such a dream to actualization. With all the motives and aids furnished by religion, only an imperfect realisation of affective social comradeship is attainable. Devoid of such auxiliaries, the merging of self in the common weal is hopeless of attainment.

Mr. Sellars's reflexions on the present world war are on the whole just and temperate. He is, however, conscious of the impotence of international Socialism to stem the torrent which has overwhelmed half of the world. And yet, he pleads, "if organized Christianity which has been in the world some nineteen centuries was powerless," why expect "a movement which is only a half-century old" to be more successful. Evidently Mr. Sellars forgets that it is for the most part a disorganized Christianity that confronts the world of to-day, while what there is of organized Christianity is for the most part ignored or denied by the modern State, just as it probably would be in the Socialist democracy whose cause he champions.

THE ORDER OF NATURE. An Essay. By Lawrence J. Henderson.
Harvard University Press, Cambridge; Humphrey Milford, London.
1917. Pp. 234.

Did usage not blunt the edge of wonderment, it were an unceasing prick to astonishment that human minds possessed of seemingly equal power of insight and inference could confront identical phenomena and yet draw opposite conclusions as regards the cause thereof. There is for instance the case of Charles Darwin. In an often quoted letter he tells of "the extreme difficulty or rather impossibility" which he felt "of conceiving this immense and wonderful universe, including man with his capacity of looking far backward and far into futurity, as the result of blind chance or necessity. When thus reflecting," he says, "I feel compelled to look to a First Cause having an intelligent mind in some degree analogous to that of man; and I deserve to be called a Theist." This conclusion he confesses was strong in his mind about the time he wrote the *Origin of Species*. Thereafter it "very gradually, with many fluctuations, grew weaker." Then came "the doubt, can the mind of man, which has, as I fully believe, been developed from a mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animals, be trusted when it draws such general conclusions?" Finally he adds, "I cannot pretend to throw the least light on such abstruse problems. The mystery of the beginnings of things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain an Agnostic."

Were this the place to do so, it might be worth while essaying a psychological study of that type of mind of which Darwin's is but one of many instances, which in the presence of the mass of evidence establishing "the order of nature" ubiquitous in the universe, can nevertheless confess itself agnostic concerning the primal cause of that order. Whereas on the other hand in the presence of that self-same evidence, other scientists not incomparable to Darwin (for instance, Pasteur, Sir William Thomson) could find no explanation thereof save the existence of a supreme intelligent cause, God. They were convinced Theists, Darwin a self-confessed agnostic. Why? Perhaps a sufficient answer could be found in the passage from his letter emphasized below? So long as he admitted the existence of the Creator to account for the primal types of life from which the biological species were hypothetically declared to have arisen, Darwin recognized the force of the teleological argument. When, however, he came to trace the descent of the human mind from a *mind as low as that possessed by the lowest animals*, he lost not only the artistic sense, as he likewise admits, but his so-called "trust" in the power of reason to draw "the general conclusions" of the Theistic argu-

ments. Obviously the logic is true to the psychology of the Darwinian intellect. If the human mind has descended from a purely animal ancestor, it is of necessity organic, a subtler modification of an organism, consequently material and therefore utterly incapable of drawing not only the conclusions included in Theism, but in any system of universal nature, especially of evolutionism. The inductions, imperfect though they be, which the latter hypothesis claims as its bases, have absolutely no validity apart from the abstract and metaphysical principles that underlie all logical processes. And if the human mind be merely an organic, not an immaterial, power, it can know nothing of such principles, cannot therefore use them in the processes of induction, and consequently cannot form any logical conclusions, least of all such vast conclusions as those which constitute the evolutionary theory.

The foregoing observations, with due limitations, apply equally to the book at hand on the order of nature. *Mutata fabula de illo narratur*. Not that Professor Henderson confesses to any past or present theistic convictions. If he ever had any, he, probably like Darwin, lost them, so insistent is he on the exclusion of "theological interests" from the discussion of finality in nature and so strongly does he "object to any argument founded on a supposed acquaintance with the conditions of Divine foreknowledge" (p. 224). Be this as it may, he has accumulated in the volume before us a mass of evidence establishing the teleology of nature, even though he refuses to admit the logical conclusion—the existence of design or a Designer. *Zweckmässigkeit* he recognizes and upholds. *Zweckstrebigkeit* he refuses to admit as logically compelling.

His line of argument is concerned exclusively with the evidence for teleology in the inanimate world—the elements of low atomic weight, especially hydrogen, oxygen, and carbon. These are seen both in themselves and in the manifold combinations to which they lend themselves to be the constituents best adapted for the maintenance and development of life. "If the extreme values and unique properties [of the elements] be considered, very many are seen to belong to the three elements—in an arrangement that brings about stability of physical and chemical conditions and diversity of phenomena, and further, the possibility of the greatest complexity, durability and activity of physico-chemical systems on the surface of our planet"—and thus these elements through their countless combinations are shown to effect an environment the fittest "possible for any kind of life in this universe". If this statement should seem exaggerated to anyone, we would refer him to Professor Henderson's pages, where an abundance of scientific evidence is set forth which to the reviewer's mind is more than persuasive. It is inevitably con-

vincing. The argumentation drawn from the field of chemistry is indeed the strong feature of the book. One can only regret that the author's philosophy is not as conclusive. Apparently he is not quite so much at home in this domain, and perhaps his psychology impedes his logic.

A REALISTIC UNIVERSE. An Introduction to Metaphysics. By John Elof Boodin, Professor of Philosophy, Carleton College. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1916. Pp. 434.

Books, as well as men, may have taking or repelling ways, which cannot be subjected to any further analysis, but must be accepted as an ultimate fact. We are sympathetically inclined toward a book if, irrespective of the drift of its contents, it gives evidence of a sincere striving after the truth and shows a freedom from cant, though we may be compelled to reject both its fundamental assumptions and final conclusions. A case in point is the present publication which, though antagonistic to all our philosophical tenets, yet arouses a sympathetic interest, largely due to the author's candor and manifest devotion to the truth. His enthusiasm betrays itself in the eloquent and exalted diction, verging sometimes on poetry and a trifle too rhapsodic for a sober treatise on metaphysics. His style recalls the cultural breadth of the lamented Professor Royce and the genial warmth of William James, both of whom the author claims as his teachers and whom he emulates as his highest models. Even when coming to close grips with an opposing system, the author never loses his scholarly placidity and the air of superior tolerance; the modern philosopher is not sufficiently concerned about the claims of objective truth, which at best he regards as an elusive ideal or an unattainable goal, to allow it to ruffle his temper or to make him indulge in violent controversy.

It would not be easy to designate the author's system by one clear-cut epithet, though we may not be far from the truth when we state that it seems to tend in the direction of realism, as the title of the book would suggest. That the author has reached a bona-fide realism, however, we dare not maintain. The old-fashioned theory of substances, at all events, he rejects. He speaks, moreover, in terms which possess a strong subjective flavor. Things are to him "individual blocks", "thought contexts", "embodiments of purpose"; they "are individual by the purposes which select them and which they fulfil"; their reality depends on whether "they make a difference to a perceiving subject". Their value is determined by the experiential background out of which they roll. A primary law of things is interpenetration; hence, they appear in more than one conceptual context, they overlap and have rough edges and a fringe,

which is not indifferent to their intrinsic meaning. "It makes a real difference to reality that it is known or appreciated. . . . Back of the new naturalism there lurks an antiquated metaphysics, that of abstract things in themselves which are indifferent to contexts. But things are what they are known—as in energy systems. Otherwise they are intellectual abstractions and no longer real. And among such systems, the cognitive system as a unique type of selective reaction, figures as one." We are not altogether sure that this manner of speech is compatible with the traditional conception of realism. Yet the author's repudiation of subjectivism is unhesitating and explicit: "If we examine the implications of experience more closely, we shall find that our experience, at any rate, seems to depend in many ways upon an extra-experiential constitution". And though this may seem very little, it is a concession of no slight importance.

As far as the ultimate constitution of the universe is concerned, the author favors a peculiar form of dynamism, which he is pleased to call pragmatic energism. The electric theory of matter he regards as an argument in support of his view. "The old static view of being, therefore, has given place to the view of dynamic processes, whether as regards the atoms of the physical sciences or the images and concepts of psychology—Being-energy." Of space and time the author entertains ultra-realistic notions; he all but hypostatizes them, a necessary consequence of his conception of matter, which he evaporizes into dynamic clusters, individualized by spatial contexts. Some sort of teleology, though we could hardly say design, is admitted; in this matter the author seems to be influenced by Bergson. "From the point of view of reason it is easier to read nature as striving to express certain types or ideals than to read ideals as chance. Nature seems to be, somehow, leading in the direction of human nature; the striving for a type somehow to be determining the direction of the series; and freedom and significant expression of life to be all the time the end to be realized."

For personal immortality and a personal divinity no provisions are made in the author's universe. We do not see how he can escape the reproach of pantheism, since the God whose name occurs several times is nothing but the harmony of the whole. "Religion adds no new values to those already mentioned. But it adds the sense of completeness, of unification, and of conservation to our finite ideal strivings."

As philosophy goes in our days, the author may be commended for his efforts to construct a world-view not too much at variance with common sense. Lofty in tone and idealistic in its main trend, his speculation embodies what is best in modern thought and, throughout, exhibits marks of vigorous thinking and moral earnestness.

C. B.

THE POEMS OF B. I. DURWARD. Illustrated Centenary Edition. With Life and Criticisms on Poetry. The Pilgrim Publishing Co., John T. Durward, Baraboo, Wis. 1917. Pp. xlvii-250.

Probably not many who read these lines will know aught of Bernard Isaac Durward, although priests of the Middle West to whose memories still cling traditions of student life of six decades ago in St. Francis Seminary, Milwaukee, may recall his teaching of English in that institution, while those who have read the earlier files of the *Leader* (St. Louis) or the *Crayon* (New York) will remember the pen-names "Bernard" and "Porte Crayon" over which many of Durward's best short poems were published. He is given no place in the anthologies of American poetry, and even the *Catholic Encyclopedia* has no mention of his name. It may seem strange that such a genuine poet should be so unknown to fame. The reason lies probably in the fact that, although Bernard Durward excelled in two arts, poetry and painting, he had not mastered the trick of self-bugling.

In the *Memoir* prefixed to the present collection, the editor, the son of the poet, declares that "Mr. Durward easily holds still the first place among American Catholic poets" (p. xlv). Whether filial partiality have any weight in the forming of this judgment one must hesitate to affirm. Certainly other judges in such matters are likely to favor other candidates. However, shunning so delicate a question and applying to the poets the maxim which so cautious a guide as Thomas of Kempen bids us employ in respect to the saints—*noli disputare de meritis sanctorum*—it will be safer here not to allow the authority of the writer to concern us, but attend to what he says. In this objective frame of mind, examining some of the poems before us, it may appear that the "Bard of the Wilding-rose" should justly be assigned a high rank, not simply among "the humbler poets", where his son places him, but among the very truest and the very sweetest of the tuneful throng.

Eliza Allen Star, in a sonnet which honors its author no less than its subject, addresses Durward as the

Bard of the Wild-rose! Never verse like thine
Has sung this wilding blooming in its dell;
No poet's eye has ever caught so well
The artless marvel of its chaste outline;
Each blushing petal's eloquent design;
The virgin freshness of its breath; the swell
Of anthered coronal, of honied cell
Wherein such precious symbols flush and shine.

The appellative probably alludes to the poem "June", which is found in the present edition (p. 40). June has been a favorite theme with the poets. But has anyone, even of the loftier, not to say "the

humbler poets", sang at once so sweetly and so truly of the month of roses as Durward? It is only spatial restrictions that withholds us from transcribing the entire page occupied by this exquisite cameo. Here are the opening verses—

Ah! placid days in June!
 You see the lilies of the valley born,
 You see the dew-drops in the springing corn
 And drink them all ere noon.
 For you the wilding rose
 Opens her blushing bosom to the light;
 For you, from clover fields of green and white
 The honied fragrance flows.
 For you, yon stream glides on,
 Bearing thy cloudless skies upon its breast,
 The picture of a soul by love possessed.

Redolent no less of genuine poesy is the tribute to May, when

Summer once more is here!
 April hath laughed, or wept itself away,
 And in its place the welcome-footed May
 Gladdens the opening year.

We feel sorely tempted to quote the whole bewitching picture of the advancing May, clad in her "robe of tender green tied round her girdle with fresh violets". But we can yield to the transcription of just these few lines—

And in her hand she bears,
 Half filled with dew, a gold-mouthed tulip cup,
 Which, if one look in ere the sun be up,
 He loses half his cares;
 For, Hebe-like, she brings
 Wine of the morning from the springs of peace,
 Whose calm shall soothe the day and will not cease
 When night hath closed her wings.

One of the most pleasing bits of idylism penned by Tennyson is the apostrophe to a sea-shell. It occurs as an episode in "Maud":

The tiny shell is forlorn,
 Void of its little living will
 That made it stir on the shore.
 Did he stand at his diamond door
 In a rainbow full?

And so on. Let those who know this gem, chiselled by the author of "Maud", turn to Mr. Durward's poem on "The Sea-Shell" (p. 46), and let them note the equality of beauty in word-painting and the superiority—*pace poetarum*—of thought, as well as imagery, which belong to the American Catholic poet. Turn over "the diamond door" and "the rainbow full" to the following picture:

Look for a moment! In its spiral cave
 What wealth of pure and tender beauty lies,
 As if some orb concealed rose on the wave
 And all its bosom tremulous should lave
 With matchless dyes.

Lowell in his pretty little "Song" to the violet addresses the wee gentle thing thus:

Thy little heart that hath with love
 Grown colored like the sky above
 On which thou lookest ever.

Notice Mr. Durward's kindred, though terser and fuller idea:

So violets grow sky-blue, and to the light
 The lilies looking clothe themselves in white.
 (p. 93).

As Saul of Tarsus was born a Roman citizen, so was Durward *born* a freeman in the republic of poets. He possesses the true Horatian requirement: *nascitur, non fit*. He is at his best in his earliest verse—greater freedom, more joyous spontaneity, swifter inspiration, subtler sympathy with nature; a happy peer he is of birds and flowers. On the other hand, as the years multiply, he perhaps loses something of the youthful *élan*. The poet's mission of teacher of truth impresses him more and his muse becomes a trifle didactic. And yet perhaps this is no marring feature, but rather lends an element of variety to his work. Moreover, Durward's was a sincerely devout soul. A convert to the faith (at the age of thirty-six; he died in 1902, at the age of eighty-five), the sturdy character of his Scottish parentage formed a solid natural basis for a robust religious life. A brilliant power of imagery, a delicate sensibility, a keen sense of the beautiful, a spontaneous gravitation toward the ideal both in nature and in art, these qualities made him alike a painter and a poet. But it is his vigorous faith, his tender piety, and his deeply religious life which, elevating and penetrating a naturally artistic soul, give his poetry a certain breadth of vision which loses nothing of its esthetic charm because of its idealism. Take, for instance, the poem entitled *The Rainbow* and compare it with the sonnet by Cosmo Monkhouse on a kindred theme, *The Spectrum*, and you will see the larger and the fuller vision which faith has lent to the Catholic poet and which his native art has enshrined in matchless imagery. The English poet asks—

How many colors here do we see,
 Like rings on God's finger? Some say three.

And the rest. Then he adds:

And so what Noah saw we see,
Nor more nor less, of God's emblazonry a shred,
A sign of glory known not yet.

Finally he sings of "what joys may yet await our wider eyes when we awake upon a wider shore"—when our eyes shall range beyond the red and violet, the prismatic limits of their earthly power. The Catholic poet sings of

The ever-glorious arch—looked at by God—
Born like love itself 'mid smiles and tears,
Old as the flood and yet forever young.

The same strange arc from God's own signet-ring.

The loveliest line that Nature ever drew
Is but a beggar on thy skirts divine.

The whole poem is filled with such beauties. But notice now faith's wider soarings:

Light is thy god-head, and the triple dyes
Thy trinity; thy blessed sacraments
The seven rainbow tints; and on, and on,
Through spaces measureless of grey and gloom,
Until we reach where outer darkness dwells.

Great God! how truly happy is the soul
Who, from the point which Thou hast meant, doth look
Upon the opulence of this bright world;
Placing in just and sweet relationships
The wondrous loveliness, link by link,
Until they form a ladder up to Thee!

Who mounts, sustained by grace, the shining steps,
His back to darkness turned, his face to light.
Yet calm and patient waits that certain hour
When he will see this beauty that he loves
Grow pale in that of which he never dreamed!

The idea here is the same as that of *The Spectrum*, but Catholic faith has added the breadth and the depth which to Monkhouse were lacking.

We have exceeded all due limits, but we must add the following selection, trusting that it may win the reader to the context. It is from Mr. Durward's prize poem (on "The Blessed Virgin")—though it failed to receive the prize, and from this failure the unpleasantnesses arose that are mentioned in Father Durward's *Memoir*. The poet addresses Our Lady as

Gem of the universe! the brightest flower
That on the tropic-girdle of our sphere
Has ever ope'd its bosom to the dew and pearly shower,
Grows pale and sere
Beside thy peerless name;
In thee, O Mystic Rose! O Lily Pure!
Blossom and Bud endure.

If this be not genuine poesy, where shall we look for it?

Concerning the Memoir introducing the poems, it should be noted that, while it is informing and interesting, it might have been still further improved by the elimination of an occasional exaggeration. For instance, mentioning an unfortunate depreciation of the English language by a certain "saintly and scholarly" prelate belonging to a past generation, the editor proceeds to call English "the language of the greatest poet (their [?] Germany having only one of even the third class—Goethe) and of the most perfect prosody the world has yet heard!" Is not this a trifle too strong?

Literary Chat.

As the helps toward prayer and meditation multiply, the great art of the saints ought to become a common accomplishment. There is no excuse for anybody to say that he cannot meditate, when such books as *The Holy Hour in Gethsemane* (Meditation on the Anima Christi. By Francis P. Donnelly, S.J. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York) are at his disposal. The author reduces meditation to the simplest and most elementary form and invests it with so much attractiveness that it will appeal to everyone that savors things spiritual and divine. As one would expect from the author, these meditations are full of vigor, grace, and pungency. They strike a virile note and are free from weak sentimentality. Here is healthy nourishment for robust piety.

Substantial meat is contained in *The Inward Gospel* (Familiar Discourses Originally Addressed to Some Who Follow the Rules of St. Ignatius. By W. D. Strappini, S.J. Longmans, Green & Co., New York). It offers sound advice and impelling motives to those who aim at perfection and try to fashion their lives according to Christian principles. It is not directly intended for the many, but for the few select souls that have been smitten by the arrow of divine love and long to walk in the footprints of the Heavenly Master. But it will be read with profit also by those who are satisfied with lower aims and will kindle in them the thirst for higher justice.

The eternal truths of our holy faith never lose their original freshness and undiminished force; they are ever as the undimmed stars and the perennial springs. So Father L. Poulin has chosen a very appropriate title for his discourses in calling them sources of living water (*Les Sources d'eau vive*. Sermons et Allocutions. 1915-1917. Pierre Téqui, Paris.). A prophetic fervor pervades these stirring utterances, inspired by the dreadful calamities that have befallen Europe. With such guides as Father Poulin, on whose lips thrones the eloquence of inspiration, the nations will find their way back to God, whom in their pride and prosperity they have deserted.

Piety, if it is to take firm root, must early be planted in the youthful heart. The most favorable time to effect this are the days of fervor that precede the First Holy Communion. Never again will the heart be so responsive to spiritual influences. Grace and nature, at this period, form happy alliance and coöperate almost without friction. Experienced pastors are not slow in improving the possibilities of this psychological condition and prepare the children for First Holy Communion by a retreat of short duration. It requires much thought and exceptional pedagogical tact to adapt the guiding truths of the religious life to the mental capacity of children. Helps in this direction

will undoubtedly be welcome. Two volumes, just published in France, will render valuable assistance in giving a retreat to the little ones. (*Retraites de Communion Solennelle*. Par le Chanoine Jean Vaudon. *Retraites de Jeunes Filles*. Par J. Millot, Vicaire Général de Versailles. Pierre Téqui, Paris.)

Directors of Sodalitys anxious to discharge their important duties with a maximum of efficiency and result, can do nothing better than to read the Life of *Father Aloysius Ignatius Fiter, Director of the Barcelona Sodality* (By F. R. R. Amodo, S.J. Edited by F. Elder Mullan, S.J. The Queen's Work, St. Louis). The book is replete with valuable suggestions and hints, not dug up from a remote past, but illustrated by the experiences of a man of our own times, who was a born organizer and leader.

Sponsa Christi, by Mother St. Paul of the Birmingham "House of Retreats," is a collection of twenty meditations for the religious on the subject of Vocation, the sacred vows, the religious Rule, the Canonical Office, and kindred themes calculated to explain and emphasize the obligations of the religious state. They are eminently practical considerations, based on a sound interpretation of the Scriptural truths which counsel perfection. The usual method of prelude, points, colloquy and resolutions is facilitated by the form of presentation, a clear expression of thought, and an absence of superfluous imagery and sentiment. The typography is helpful in the same direction. Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J., recommends the little manual in a pertinent preface. (Longmans, Green, and Co., New York.)

Camp St. Mary is entering upon its third season with the country involved in the war. Young men going out into the priesthood in these times may be called upon to prove their mettle as never before. But all grades of the clergy will feel the strain. Camp St. Mary aims to send young men into the sacred ministry better equipped to meet the physical and mental strain that promises to be so much more pronounced in war times. Moreover, by initiating them into outdoor life and into habits of self-reliance and mutual helpfulness, the camp will vindicate its usefulness as a moral influence also.

The camp is exclusively for seminarians and the clergy. Full information may be had by applying to the Rev. Charles E. Boone, St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md., or after 1st July, to Camp St. Mary, Long Lake, N. Y.

The connexion between Modernism and the philosophy of Kant is not difficult to see, even at a glance, by those who know the essential constituents of the two systems. Kant denied the power of the intellect to reach objective truth in the supersensible order. Neither will he allow things sensible to be apprehended save under forms which, being subjective, prevent the mind from seizing the real world as it is. Modernism holds substantially the same views, and applies them to the teachings of faith. The truths of faith cannot be intellectually grasped or represented in language. They can only be felt experientially, taken in by instinct, feeling, emotion, will.

All this is sufficiently plain. What is not so plain is the Kantian philosophy as an organic system. To those who wish to get a closer knowledge of that philosophy, and without spending overmuch time and grey matter in the quest, may be recommended a little book by the Abbé Van Loo, bearing the title *Kantisme et Modernisme* (pp. 236). The treatment is synoptical, precise, and clear. Needless to say, the author does not conceal his anti-Teutonic feelings; and he will probably do less so in a volume which is in preparation and to be entitled *Modernisme et Catholicisme en Allemagne Contemporaine*. Perhaps the saddest feature of the present war is the mutual recriminations of Catholics. (Pierre Téqui, Paris.)

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace has established a unique organ of intercommunication between the American Republics, North and South. The new *Review* is entitled the *Inter-American* and will be published alternately in English and Spanish. The English issue will contain translations of current articles which have recently appeared in Spanish or Portuguese and which will interest particularly the people of the North, while the Spanish issue will contain translations of English articles interesting to the Southern people. The aim is obviously interchange of peaceful ideas between the two great communities.

The first number of the *Inter-American* in Spanish appeared in May. It contains papers chiefly political, economic, and scientific, translated from our principal magazines. The first English number is to be issued in October. Thereafter the publications are to alternate bi-monthly. The publishers are Doubleday, Page & Co., New York.

There is a new edition of the Roman Breviary printed on India paper, measuring 5 x 3 $\frac{3}{4}$ inches, and weighing nine ounces, which will appeal to many clerics as most convenient for the summer and travel. Its arrangement includes the latest rubrical rules and feasts. The type is small but very clear, and the price (eight dollars) reasonable. (B. Herder, St. Louis; Gill & Son, Dublin.)

To write a story that is wholesome in its general tendency and free from objectionable details, and at the same time absorbingly interesting and brimful of delicious humor, may to some seem an almost impossible task. Yet it has been accomplished by Mary T. Waggaman in her latest charming novel (*Grapes of Thorns*. Benziger Bros., New York). We have intrigue, adventure, tragic retribution, and a happy consummation moulded into a swift-moving narrative, not for one moment permitting the interest to flag. If the character of the heroine is somewhat idealized, she is not, for all that, a bloodless, phantom-like figure, but a living being, which we can well conceive as having reality and a local habitation. The events lead us to the ocean shore, lashed by furious storms, and into romantic mountain scenery, described by the pen of an artist and steeped in rich and glowing colors.

The Rest House (A Novel by Isabel Clark. Benziger Bros., New York). is a story of a conversion sweetly blended with a love-story of exquisite beauty. The unfolding of a chaste passion in the heart of the convert is told with consummate skill. Her noble figure stands out against the background of a very indifferent environment, in plastic relief and striking vividness. Though the threads of the tale are no wise entangled, the story grips the heart from the outset and does not relax its hold to the end.

An Irishman outwitted by an Englishman is the fruitful theme of a sprightly comedy by Louis J. Walsh (*The Guileless Saxon*. An Ulster Comedy in Three Acts. M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin). In this easy form the author wishes to throw some searching lights on the Irish question and convey to the outside world an important message. There is a grim truth in the concluding remark of the disappointed Irish innkeeper: "For an Englishman will always get the better of you in a money transaction."

The Chosen People, by Sydney L. Nyburg, proclaims itself to be "a novel of men and women, work and faith". Nothing unusual about that. Most novels would fit in with a classification so general. The specific difference between this story and other tales that are built mainly round industrial struggles is that *The Chosen People*, as the title indicates, deals with Jews. They are the men and women of the story. There is only one character of any account in the

book who is not a Jew. She is of mixed Irish and Scotch origin, and a very odd and unattractive compound she is, though the author doubtless thought to make her more than acceptable. Despite a certain display of unselfishness and resolution, her character is very hollow; and the same is to be said of the young Rabbi, who is designed as the central figure of the story. But Mr. Nyburg affords us a vivid glimpse of the Jews, orthodox and reformed, Russian and German, those of the capitalist group and the revolutionists, as they are found in our large industrial centres. The relations between the two elements are strained and utterly unsympathetic, according to our Jewish author. (J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.)

Books Received.

SCRIPTURAL.

BREVE INTRODUCCIÓN A LA CRÍTICA TEXTUAL DEL A. T. Por A. Fernández Truyols, S.I., Prof. en el P. I. B. Fasc. I. (*Estudios de Crítica Textual y Literaria.*) Pontificio Instituto Bíblico, Roma. 1917. Pp. xii-152. Prezzo, 4 L.

I SAM. I-15. CRÍTICA TEXTUAL. Por A. Fernández Truyols, S.I., Prof. en el P. I. B. Fasc. II. (*Estudios de Crítica Textual y Literaria.*) Pontificio Instituto Bíblico, Roma. 1917. Pp. vii-93. Prezzo, 3 L.

EPHOD AND ARK. A Study in the Records and Religion of the Ancient Hebrews. By William R. Arnold, Hitchcock Professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary. (*Harvard Theological Studies*, III.) Harvard University Press, Cambridge; Humphrey Milford, London. 1917. Pp. 170.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

THE HOLY HOUR IN GETHSEMANE. Meditations on the Anima Christi. By Francis P. Donnelly, S.J., author of *Watching an Hour, Mustard Seed*, etc. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1917. Pp. 212. Price, \$0.80 *postpaid*.

THE INWARD GOSPEL. Familiar Discourses Originally Addressed to Some Who Follow the Rules of St. Ignatius. By Walter Diver Strappini, S.J., author of *Meditations Without Method*. Second and enlarged edition. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1917. Pp. 149. Price, \$1.25 (3/6) *net*.

THE FAIREST ARGUMENT. For Our Non-Catholic Friends. By the Rev. John F. Noll, LL.D., author of *Father Smith Instructs Jackson, Kind Words from Your Pastor*, etc. Third edition. Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Indiana. 1917. Pp. 399. Prices, net: paper, \$0.25; cloth, \$0.75.

LES SOURCES D'EAU VIVE. Sermons et Allocutions. 1915-1917. Par L. Poulin, Chanoine Honoraire de Paris, Curé de la Sainte-Trinité. Pierre Téqui, Paris. 1917. Pp. xiv-362. Prix, 3 fr. 50.

RETRAITES DE COMMUNION SOLENNELLE. Pour les Prêtres. Pour les Enfants. Par le Chanoine Jean Vaudon. 1. L'Agneau de Dieu. Pierre Téqui, Paris. 1917. Pp. xxi-240. Prix, 2 fr.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE PRINCIPLES OF NATURAL TAXATION. Showing the Origin and Progress of Plans for the Payment of All Public Expenses from Economic Rent. By C. B. Fillebrown, author of *A B C of Taxation, Taxation*, etc. With portraits. A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago. 1917. Pp. xx-281. Price, \$1.50.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT. From the Standpoint of Religious Values. By Harry F. Ward, Professor of Social Service, Boston University School of Theology, and Secretary, The Methodist Federation for Social Service. The verbatim stenographic report of a series of noon-day lectures delivered at Ford Hall, Boston, 1915, together with the questions and answers of the forum period following each lecture. Sturgis & Walton Co., New York. 1917. Pp. viii—199. Price, \$1.35 *postpaid*.

POLITICS. By Heinrich von Treitschke. Translated from the German by Blanche Dugdale and Torben De Bille. With an Introduction by the Rt. Hon. Arthur James Balfour, M.A., F.R.S., LL.D., D.C.L., and a Foreword by A. Lawrence Lowell, President of Harvard University. Two volumes. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1916. Pp. xlv—406 and 643. Price, \$7.00.

KANTISME ET MODERNISME. Essai Philosophique et Théologique. Par M. l'Abbé Van Loo. Pierre Téqui, Paris; Action Bibliographique Sociale, Genève. 1917. Pp. xiv—222. Prix, 3 fr.

LITURGICAL.

THREE MOTETS FOR FOUR MALE VOICES. 1. O Sanctissima; 2. O Salutaris; 3. Tantum Ergo. By Joseph J. McGrath. (*Fischer Edition*, No. 4286.) J. Fischer & Brother, New York. 1917. Pp. 15. Price, \$0.40.

HISTORICAL.

A MEMORIAL OF ANDREW J. SHIPMAN. His Life and Writings. Edited by Condé B. Pallen, Ph.D., LL.D. Encyclopedia Press, Inc., New York. Pp. lxx—362.

FOURTH BIENNIAL MEETING OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES. Proceedings published by Direction of the Executive Committee of the Conference. 17-20 September, 1916. Catholic University of America, Washington. Pp. 420.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF SUPERINTENDENT OF PARISH SCHOOLS. Archdiocese of San Francisco, California. 1915-1916. Pp. 128.

BENOÎT XV ET LA GUERRE. 1914-1917. Par M. l'Abbé E. Duplessy, Directeur de *La Réponse*. Pierre Téqui, Paris. 1917. Pp. ix—101. Prix, 1 fr.

THOMAS MAURICE MULRY. By Thomas F. Meehan. The Encyclopedia Press, Inc., New York. 1917. Pp. 247.

THE SISTERS OF CHARITY OF NAZARETH, KENTUCKY. By Anna Blanche McGill. The Encyclopedia Press, New York. 1917. Pp. xvi—436.

NAMES THAT LIVE IN CATHOLIC HEARTS. Memoirs of Cardinal Ximenes, Michael Angelo, Samuel de Champlain, Archbishop Plunkett, Charles Carroll, Henri de Larochejacquelein, Simon de Montfort. By Anna T. Sadlier. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 265. Price, \$0.50.

DANS LES FLANDRES. Notes d'un Volontaire de la Croix Rouge, 1914-1915. Par D. Bertrand de Laflotte. Préface de M. le Bâtonnier Henri-Robert. Quatrième édition. Bloud & Gay, Paris et Barcelone. 1917. Pp. 285.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE CHOSEN PEOPLE. By Sidney L. Nyburg, author of *The Final Verdict*, *The Conquest*, etc. J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia. 1917. Pp. 363. Price, \$1.40 *net*.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(LVII).—AUGUST, 1917.—No. 2.

NATIVE OLERGY FOR MISSION COUNTRIES.

THE Society for the Propagation of the Faith exists to provide funds, not men, for the mission field. In so far, however, as money can replace or multiply men we shall be within our sphere if we try to devise some means, at the present crisis, of providing against the fatal shortage of men which threatens the missions in the near future.

SLOW PROGRESS OF THE MISSIONS.

Friends of the missions—and all those who have the true love of God in their hearts are their friends—ask sometimes: “Why has not the Church made greater progress among infidels and pagans? For 1900 years she has sent apostles to all parts of the world, and yet out of fifteen hundred millions of human beings, hardly three hundred millions are in the fold. Yes, we have heard of the zeal and devotion of our missionaries, and of the wonderful results they obtain with the slender means at their disposal; but how slow their progress! At that rate, when will the world be converted?” And these good people are pained, and somewhat scandalized at the apparent failure of Christianity, which fact its enemies do not fail to use as an argument against its Divinity.

There are many obstacles to the diffusion of the Gospel besides the powers of darkness, as active to-day as in the time of our Lord. The object of this paper is to consider and to ask aid in remedying one of the causes which delay the christianization of the world; viz. the lack of missionaries.

INSUFFICIENT NUMBER OF WORKERS.

It is an indisputable fact that the number of workers in the mission field is out of all proportion to the task to be performed. A glance at the statistics of those countries which are still pagan or where Christianity is the religion of an insignificant minority will demonstrate our assertion more eloquently than any words. Although approximative, these statistics will give a fair idea of the state of affairs.

Japan and Corea

Total population	62,000,000
Number of Catholics	162,000
Number of priests	282

which means that there is one priest ministering to 575 Catholics and working for the conversion of 220,000 infidels.

China

Total population	420,000,000
Number of Catholics	1,820,000
Number of priests	2,380

or, one priest for 768 Catholics and 179,193 pagans.

Indo-China

Total population	42,000,000
Number of Catholics	1,035,000
Number of priests	1,081

or, one priest for 957 Catholics and 40,000 pagans.

India

Total population	294,000,000
Number of Catholics	2,400,000
Number of priests in mission districts	2,800

or, one priest for 858 Catholics and 105,000 pagans.

Africa

Population of mission districts	157,000,000
Number of Catholics	750,000
Number of priests	1,903

or, one priest for 400 Catholics and 82,000 infidels.

Oceanica

Population of mission districts	4,000,000
Number of Catholics	130,000
Number of priests	360

or, one priest for 306 Catholics and 111,000 infidels.

In these statistics we suppose that every one of the priests is engaged in parochial work, which is not the case. Not a few of them are professors in colleges and seminaries; chaplains in hospitals; others are on the retired list on account of age, infirmity, etc., which reduces considerably the number of workers. As a matter of fact, in certain dioceses, for instance in India, it is not unusual for *one* priest to minister to *three* and even *four thousand* Catholics. If we keep this in mind and consider the obstacles to apostolic labors caused by poverty, climate, language, distances, etc., not to speak of continual opposition and occasional persecution, we may wonder that our missionaries report any progress at all.

EFFECTS OF THE WAR ON THE MISSIONS.

All over the world the Church is affected by the war. Its disastrous consequences are far-reaching and will be felt for many years to come. Our missions are not merely suffering, but their very existence in a number of places is threatened, not so much because of lack of funds as because of lack of missionaries.

At the beginning of the war three-fourths of the missionaries were of French nationality. Owing to an iniquitous law a large number of them were called to the colors. Whether those living under a foreign flag should have answered the call or not, it is not our purpose to discuss here. The question has been treated by a Japanese missionary in the May 1916 number of the *Catholic World*, and we entirely agree with him that under the circumstances they could not do otherwise; the good of the missions demanded it. The fact remains that a large number have left their missions, many never to return, and not a few to return broken in health if not in spirits. In most European countries the mission schools and seminaries are practically empty, and now that the United States has decided to take a hand in the great conflict, God grant that our own clergy and seminaries be not similarly affected by the war.

However, even assuming that Providence will give the world a speedy peace; that new mission societies will arise; that the old ones will extend their recruiting activities; that the superiors of the missions will so place their missionaries as to cover the maximum ground with the minimum number—still for all these effects, the situation bids fair to be hopelessly out of hand within one generation, if we are forever to depend so largely on extra-mission sources of supply. But by fostering the largest possible number of vocations among the natives of the various missions themselves, we may solve an immediate problem; at any rate we shall be working toward the entirely desirable consummation of making the Church indigenous in mission countries. Bishop Seguin, P.F.M., of Kui-chou, China, writes: "If I am to insure the future of my mission I must strain every effort to prepare a native clergy now." This is the view taken by all the bishops in the mission field.

THE CHURCH WANTS NATIVE CLERGY.

The formation of a native clergy for the evangelization of heathen lands has always been the wish of the Church. In the sixteenth century St. Francis Xavier recommended it be done as soon as possible, and Leo XIII wrote in his letter to the Hindus (1893): "The zeal of the missionaries from Europe meets with many obstacles, the greatest being the ignorance of a language sometimes most difficult to master, and new customs and habits to which one is not used even after many years. It is evident that native priests will inspire greater confidence and their work will be followed by more lasting results."

This is the reason why when the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda entrusts to a religious order or missionary society a portion of the world to evangelize, it recommends the establishment of seminaries where natives will be trained for the priesthood and prepared to preach and minister to their countrymen. Native clergy alone will strengthen the position of the Church; it cannot be said to be solidly implanted in a country where there is no native clergy, even if all the inhabitants were converted to the faith.

Have the instructions of the Propaganda been faithfully obeyed? It is not our purpose to discuss this point. We may say in passing that certain superiors seem more anxious to re-

cruit members for their congregations than for the secular clergy, on whom nevertheless rests the real organization of a diocese.

NUMBER OF NATIVE PRIESTS IN THE FAR EAST.

It must not be believed, however, that nothing has been done in this direction. At present there are 60 native priests in Japan and Corea; 830 in China; 700 in Indo-China; 850 in India and Ceylon. This is certainly a good beginning, but only a beginning. Multiplied by a hundred, the number of those native priests would not be too large for the gigantic task of converting the eight hundred millions of heathens or infidels of the Asiatic continent.

Let us observe here that the remarks which follow do not apply to Africa and the Islands of the Pacific and the South Seas. The question of a native clergy for those countries must be treated separately.

At present an urgent propaganda is being carried on by all missionary bishops for the increase of the native clergy to fill gaps in the ranks of European missionaries. We are not ignorant of the danger of going too fast in this important but delicate matter. Oriental characteristics are to be reckoned with, and while they do not invalidate our hopes they caution us to infinite patience and prudence. Still, cultivated the native element must be. It was always a duty; it has become a necessity. No missionary society or bishop but has made experiments and formed opinions as to the methods best calculated to attain an end which all alike admit to be essential. What concerns us is that, from our correspondence with the missions, we become increasingly alive to the fact that the financial situation is the chief bar to sure, if slow, success. Before showing how we can save the day, a few remarks on the training of the native clergy and on the quality of its work may interest our readers and stimulate their charity.

SEMINARIES IN MISSION COUNTRIES.

As early as the year 1664, Bishop Lambert de la Motte, one of the founders of the Paris Society for Foreign Missions, established at Juthia (Siam) a general seminary which would admit pupils from all the missions of Cochin-China, Tonkin,

China, India, Corea, and Japan. Twelve years later, in 1680, thirty natives had already been ordained to the priesthood, and the number of the faithful increased with remarkable rapidity.

In 1805 the seminary of Juthia was transferred to Pulo Penang, in the Malacca Peninsula. Owing to the foundation of a number of local seminaries by bishops desirous of sparing their clerics long separation from their relatives, costly journeys, change of climates, etc., the seminary of Pulo Penang has not the same importance as formerly, but there is probably no seminary in the world that has the honor, as this one has, of having given over a hundred martyrs to the Church, several of whom have been beatified.

In 1893 Pope Leo XIII founded a general seminary for India at Kandy, in the Island of Ceylon, and placed it under the direction of Jesuit Fathers of the Belgian Province. Up to date it has given over 150 priests to the Church in India, of whom two have been raised to the episcopacy, Mgr. Kaudatkil, coadjutor to the Vicar Apostolic of Ernaculam, 1911, and Mgr. Beekmayer, Bishop of Kandy, in 1912. Bishop Kaudatkil is a Syrian of the Malabar rite, and Bishop Beekmayer is a native of Ceylon and a member of the Benedictine Order.

Those two houses receive students from dioceses and vicariates which, being of recent foundation, have not as yet their own preparatory college and seminary.

THE COURSE OF STUDY.

When signs of vocation are observed, the children are sent to a preparatory school. The selection is always made among the children of families that have been Christian at least for two or three generations; it takes a long time to eradicate completely the virus of heathenism which has poisoned these poor people for thousands of years.

After two or three years of training, if the boys prove satisfactory they are sent to college, where their education is continued. They have the usual studies—grammar, geography, arithmetic, the sciences, and Latin, which they are taught to write accurately and to speak fluently. Latin is the language of the house, and all their philosophical and theological studies are pursued in that tongue. We often receive letters in Latin from Chinese and Japanese priests and we may say that few of our priests could equal them for correctness and elegance.

Great attention is also given to the study of history and literature, that they may be in no way inferior to the scholars of the country.

After the classical course they spend a couple of years in the school for catechists. When they have graduated they are sent by the bishop for several years to teach the elements of Christian doctrine to little orphans, school children, catechumens, and patients in the hospitals. If their work has been satisfactory they are admitted into the seminary for a five or six years' course which comprises all the branches of ecclesiastical science.

Most native students would make good figure in our seminaries. The Oriental mind is subtle and grasps promptly philosophical and theological questions. Perhaps they do not assimilate as much as might be desirable, but this must not surprise us. Who is the American or European able to understand Oriental logic thoroughly? The difficulties we find in trying to read the Eastern mind, Orientals encounter in the philosophical systems of the Western world. With this exception, we may say that Japanese, Chinese, Annamites, Hindu seminarians make very good students.

Generally, in our houses of education, young professors begin to teach the minor classes and are raised by degrees to the higher courses; the contrary is the case in the Far East. They begin teaching Theology, then Philosophy, then the classics, and finally after several years, when they are thoroughly conversant with the language and customs of the country, are appointed to teach in the lower classes, grammar, Latin, etc. It is in fact much more difficult to understand the mentality of those boys and to place within their reach a teaching for which they have been little prepared by their early education than to teach young men who have spent several years in college and seminary and know Latin thoroughly; furthermore, a perfect knowledge of the language of the country is necessary, and it takes years of study and practice to acquire this.

DISCIPLINE AND RELIGIOUS TRAINING.

The rules of houses of education in the countries named are different from ours. Much more time is given to rest and recreation. No Oriental mind could stand a system of studies

as intense as that given to our students. And even with that moderation, how many clerics giving great hopes for the future have died at twenty or twenty-five from debility caused by study.

The discipline is not as severe as in our seminaries and needs not be. "When I was appointed professor in the seminary," writes a missionary who has spent a long life in that responsible position, "I was struck by the seriousness of the students; in the Far East the boy wants to be considered as a man and aims at acting as such. In fact it is not necessary to exercise much supervision over our students."

The religious training is of course the same as in our seminaries. Whatever the latitude under which they are born, whatever their mentality, all men suffer from the same consequences of original sin; they all have the same passions which must be regulated or guarded against. The same spiritual exercises as with us are made use of to attain that end: Mass, Communion, meditation, visits to the Blessed Sacrament, monthly recollections, annual retreats, etc.

To urge them to the love and service of God, not a few of these seminarians have incentives and family traditions unknown to us. In their youth, at home, they may have been told by their parents: "Your great grandfather suffered for the Faith; he was in prison for one or several years; he was tortured and finally strangled;" or "Your grandfather was beheaded because he refused to abjure Christ our Saviour!" In those countries where reverence, almost worship, for ancestors is so deeply implanted in the hearts of the people, it is unnecessary to add: "You must be worthy of your forefathers!"

There are seminaries where certain students have relatives or ancestors who have been raised to our Altars by the Church, and every day they may pray before their relics exposed to public veneration. There are others where students may visit occasionally a "Field of Martyrs"—spots where confessors of the Faith were executed not many years ago. The seminary of Ryong-San in Corea is only a few miles distant from the "Mountain of the Three Saints", where Bishop Imbert and Fathers Maubant and Chastan were put to death in 1839; seminarians go there for rest and meditation. The seminary of Keso in Western Tonkin is in the midst of cities and towns

where many priests and Christians suffered martyrdom. From the college of Phu-senan in North Cochin-China it is only a few minutes' walk to the bridge of Boi-dau where Blessed Isidor Gagelin was strangled, he being the first martyr of the Annamite persecutions in the nineteenth century.

The Seminary of Nagasaki (Japan), which was begun in 1866 and which has already given 54 native priests, is located at Oura, opposite the Holy Mount where in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries hundreds of missionaries and Christians were put to death for the Faith after excruciating tortures. What an incentive for the students to visit in Nagasaki the places where 26 martyrs were crucified in 1597, among them a Mexican and Franciscan Brother, St. Philip of Jesus.

ANOTHER TRIAL.

Before taking the decisive step of subdeaconship, the seminarian must spend another year or two in some mission and labor with an experienced missionary, to learn all about the work, to try his strength and show what he may do later on. The test of the battlefield proves the soldier's real courage. If he returns with a favorable report he resumes his studies and is ordained in due time, generally not before he is 30 or 35 years of age and sometimes older. If the trial has not been satisfactory he may be given a second one with another missionary, after which a final decision is reached.

DO NATIVES MAKE GOOD PRIESTS?

We will let Bishop Reynaud, C.M., of E. Chekiang answer the question; he has been in China for forty-three years, has a number of native priests under his jurisdiction, and a seminary with 55 students; he is therefore well acquainted with the subject. "The native priests," he writes, "are always valuable auxiliaries. They work well and render great services to religion. They are almost indispensable because they understand far better than Europeans the language and customs of the country and the mentality, prejudices, aspirations, and defects of their compatriots. All this knowledge is very necessary for the progress of religion, and in regulating any difficulties that may arise in the direction of the vicariate.

"To try to get on without the help of native priests would be to render ourselves unable to do good. They are like bridges between us and the people. The natives talk to them before they come to us. I might almost say they acclimatize the Faith in a country suspicious of all that comes from the outside world. This is, therefore, the work of works, the most urgent, the most efficacious, the most deserving. It is also the most expensive"

Bishop Perini, S.J., of Mangalore, India, wrote us recently: "The six native priests educated in my local seminary and ordained last September, have taken up work in various stations and show great zeal and ability. Thus the many sacrifices I had to make during their nine years of seminary life are fully recompensed by the excellent work they are doing."

WORK OF THE NATIVE CLERGY.

The native priests work in the ministry either as assistants or pastors, no distinction being made between them and the European missionaries, although they are not subject to the special rules of the Religious Orders to which the latter may belong. They are sometimes at the head of important parishes of three or four thousand Catholics, as in India, or of one thousand, as in China, Japan, Corea. They are also employed as professors in colleges or seminaries. Some write or translate works of devotion or instruction. We cannot publish a complete catalogue, but here are a few titles: *Sebattiana parvadam* (Mountain of Prayer and Meditation) by Father Louis; *Motcha radari* (Passport for Heaven) by Father Rattinanader; *Ieju talei sarppa sangaram* (Destruction of the Seven Deadly Snakes) by Father Arokianadar. All these authors are Hindu priests.

We know of at least thirty volumes published by Japanese and twenty by Annamite priests. In Western Cochin-China Father Qui has published *Sach gam quant nam* (Meditations for Every Day of the Year) in five volumes. From a literary point of view the best known priest in Western Tonkin was Father Six. He wrote books of poetry much admired by Annamite scholars, and by his diplomatic abilities rendered invaluable services both to his country and the missions at the time of the conquest of Tonkin by France. He was appointed

honorary minister by the Annamite authorities and made an officer of the Legion of Honor by the French Government.

As far as moral character is concerned, we have no hesitation to say that the native priests of Japan, China, Indo-China, and India compare favorably with the clergy of America and Europe. They are pious, devoted and zealous workers. Defects of race, cast, temperament they have, like the clergy of any other country; they might be more learned, more humble, more disinterested, like many of our own clergy; but scandals are rare and defections not more numerous than with us. What the late Bishop Bonnard of Pondicherry wrote years ago is still true: "We may endeavor to improve our native clergy, but it needs no radical change in its constitution."

The native clergy of the Far East have written some glorious pages in the history of the Church. Frightful persecutions took place in those unhappy countries throughout the nineteenth century. In the provinces of Tonkin and Cochinchina alone, 79 native priests were put to death for the Faith between the years 1858 and 1862. One of them who had been recently ordained, Father James Nam, being urged to apostatize, exclaimed: "I, a priest, could trample on the Cross? abandon a Church of whom I am a minister? Must I not practise what I preach? A Christian must die rather than give up his Faith, and who will die for the Faith if the priest does not set the example?"

In China and Corea numerous were the martyrs among the native clergy; eighteen were placed on our Altars by Pope Leo XIII in 1900, and seven by Pope Pius X in 1909.

NATIVE PRIESTS MAY SAVE THE CHURCH IN THEIR COUNTRIES.

The native clergy are not merely useful as auxiliaries to the missionaries; they may be called upon to replace them in case of emergency and thus save the very existence of the Church in their countries. In fact, history shows that they have done so on several occasions. At the end of the eighteenth century when the French revolution and the Napoleonic Wars prevented the training and sending of missionaries for many years, it was by two or three hundred priests that the ministry was continued in the Far East. The same thing is taking place at

the present time; owing to the departure of a number of the European missionaries, in many a place the practice of religion would be discontinued but for the native clergy who at the cost of great sacrifices are supplying the places of their absent brethren.

On the other hand history shows that if at certain periods persecutions succeeded in extinguishing the Church absolutely in a country, it may have been due to the lack of native clergy. In the fourteenth century there were no less than eleven archbishops or bishops, with a corresponding number of priests in China, all Europeans, and the Christians numbered more than one hundred thousand; but we have no record that an effort was ever made to educate any native for the priesthood. In 1483 the last missionary to that unfortunate country was put to death, and when two centuries later the first Jesuit priests arrived in Peking they found no traces of Christianity.

It is not unlikely that the Church of Japan would have been saved if St. Francis Xavier's advice to educate and ordain natives had been followed. This is confirmed by the fact that, despite the absence of clergy, the Faith was kept alive and certain religious practices observed for over two centuries among several thousands of Japanese, as was discovered in 1865 by the first French missionaries who had resumed a few years before the evangelization of the country.

WHY NOT A LARGER NUMBER OF NATIVE PRIESTS?

The question which will probably now occur to our readers is the following: If the native clergy of the Far East possess the qualities described above, if they are capable of rendering such eminent services, why not multiply their number, especially now that the supply of missionaries from Europe is threatened to grow considerably less?

It is in order to answer this question that we have presented the foregoing remarks to American Catholics and more especially to our brethren in the clergy, at the request of numerous bishops of those countries.

The reason why the native clergy is not more numerous in the Far East is not the lack of vocations, but the lack of funds to educate the candidates.

Now, as in the time of our Lord, it is to the poor that the Gospel is preached. The proud Japanese, the rich Chinese, and the opulent Hindu have no inclination to listen to the missionary. The great majority of converts come from the poorest part of the nation. Parents therefore can pay practically nothing toward the education of their children; indeed the bishop must be grateful when they consent to deprive themselves of the valuable services these young men could have rendered in lessening the burden of the family.

From this it follows that from the time a boy enters the preparatory school, then college, then seminary, up to the day of his ordination he must be supported by the mission. For seminarians, we except the years of probation during which they are supported by the missionaries they assist. Of course the cost of maintaining a boy in college and a young man in seminary is less than here. But when we consider that some missions have one hundred, and in some cases as many as two hundred seminarians or college boys, it will be admitted that their support must be a cause of anxiety for the bishop. In fact, of late, several bishops have been obliged because of lack of resources to dismiss a number of their students. Not long ago a bishop from Japan wrote us: "I may be able to keep our seminary open for another year; after that, if Providence does not come to my rescue, I will have to close it."

WHAT IS THE COST OF MAINTAINING A STUDENT IN A SEMINARY?

It is impossible to give to this question an answer that will cover all the missions of the Far East, because the cost of living is not the same in all those countries. It is higher for instance in India or Japan than in China. After gathering much information on the subject we may state that an average of \$60.00 a year is sufficient to support a native student in the departments of Theology or Philosophy. We do not suggest any specific sum for the earlier years, because (as in our own colleges) the sifting process is not over at that time, and benefactors are apt to be permanently discouraged if the subject in whom they are interested happens not to develop a vocation. The total cost therefore would be \$360.00 for a course of six years in the seminary.

Some may be surprised at the small amount required, but we must remember that in those countries the value of money is higher and the cost of living lower than with us; that the professors receive no salary, and that the young men live more frugally than we do. The comfort, not to say the sumptuousness, of certain American seminaries is unknown in Chinese and Hindu seminaries.

How many priests in the United States could spare \$5.00 a month from their salary and pay for the education of a young man who will one day be his brother in the priesthood? How many Catholics, not desirous to foster a sacerdotal vocation in their sons, could with that small amount help those who are anxious to give themselves to the Lord, but have not the means? Many parishes in the United States have never given a priest to the Church, although they have long been benefited by the services of one of God's ministers. As a mark of gratitude for that blessing could they not pay for a student in the field afar and thus make up for what they are unable to furnish from their own ranks?

The offer of supporting a student in the seminary is always gratefully accepted by our missionary bishops. But naturally they much prefer to have in hand the capital which will produce the necessary yearly amount. In other words the foundation of a burse in perpetuity is preferable to a monthly or even a yearly payment. The benefactor who has promised such payment may become unable to continue it, and the bishop who on the strength of that promise has received a student has to make up the deficiency.

WHAT IS THE COST OF FOUNDING A BURSE?

It is the ambition of every priest to "continue himself at the Altar". The burse is the obvious means. Now not every priest can afford the large amount required to produce an interest sufficient for the maintenance of a student in one of our American seminaries. In mission countries the amount is considerably less; besides which fact, many are rightly anxious to place their money where, without it, there will be no priest.

The amount to be required for one of these burses is a matter of considerable difficulty for reasons mentioned above. Various missionary bishops quote widely divergent figures, but

we must have a uniform rate for justice's sake. Taking therefore an average, we venture to state that a sum of \$1000.00 will found a burse in perpetuity for the training of an ecclesiastical student in any seminary in Japan, Corea, China, Indo-China, and India. Attempts to "underbid" us in these figures will of course be made; but on mature reflection we are convinced that this will be definitely to the detriment of the cause for which we are alike working.

Besides this desire on the part of the priests to provide for themselves a successor at the Altar, another burse-producing thought is that of a bishop or a seminary president who believes that the blessing of God will be on his own institution if from its more or less abundant resources it provides for the education of one native seminarian abroad. We know of at least one seminary in the United States that has already adopted this plan, having undertaken to provide by gradual small amounts paid yearly, a complete burse for a seminary in India.

Some time ago we had the visit of a Chinese bishop and in the course of a conversation on this subject he remarked: "It is easy for you to urge the formation of a native clergy, but not only do I have to pay the expense of their education, but also to support them, in part at least, after they are ordained. Where shall I find the means?" A bishop from Japan recently wrote us that he could ordain four or five priests every year but refrained from doing so as he did not know where to find the money for their support.

A native will of course live on much less than a European; in any part of the Far East an extra allowance of ten dollars per month will probably suffice, in some parts even less. Nevertheless, it is a heavy burden for a bishop when he has a large number to support, like Bishop Munagorri, O.P., who has 92 native priests in his Vicariate of Central Tonkin. As we remarked above, the Christians belong to the poorest part of the population and generally have large families; they can contribute but little to the support of their pastors.

Here again to pay every year (\$120.00) for the support of a priest in these missions, or to found a burse for that purpose (from \$1500.00 to \$2000.00), would be a meritorious act of charity. We know of an American bishop who for several

years has been supporting two priests in China as a means of obtaining the blessing of God on his own diocese.

AN APPEAL.

This appeal is addressed especially to the clergy, but it might be heard by the laity as well. There are good Catholic parents of boys who seemed to be called to the priesthood but whom our Lord took before they reached the Altar. There is no more suitable memorial to the departed one than to provide for a substitute. Bishop Demange, P.F.M., of Corea wrote the following: "It is praiseworthy to build temples to the glory of God, but a far greater charity to give to the Church a priest who will build Him temples of souls. To be represented by an apostle who offers up each day of his life the Divine Victim, and who labors continually for the extension of our Saviour's Kingdom would seem to me a work of predestination."

Another bishop, asking for aid in supporting his native seminarians in China, indulges in this bit of fancy: "Often I picture what will take place when the soul of the clergy or the lay person who has given a priest to the missions appears before the Judgment Seat; possibly that soul will say: 'Truly, O Master, when on earth I was lacking in zeal and devotion; I was negligent of my duty; I committed errors through self-interest or the interest of my family. But Thou hast said that not even a glass of water given in Thy Name shall go unrewarded: therefore Thou wilt remember the souls saved by the priest who, through my assistance, has consecrated himself to Thee, and Thou wilt have mercy on me.'"¹

JOSEPH FRERI,

National Director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

¹ The Society for the Propagation of the Faith will give further information to charitable persons interested in the training and support of native clergy for mission countries. It will assume all responsibility for the transmission of donations for that object and will see that the intentions of the donors are faithfully carried out.

THE NEW EDITION OF THE ROMAN RITUAL.

TO Pope Pius X of blessed memory are attributed many changes for the better in matters ecclesiastical. Liturgy in general, as well as its subsidiary science of Sacred Music, has felt the great Pope's impress. Under his provident supervision even the Roman Ritual was revised and enlarged. Attention is directed to the following observations in regard to the *editio typica* of the Ritual, which was published many months since, in accordance with the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites of 11 June, 1913.

THE CONFERRING OF BAPTISM.

In the second chapter of the second title, rubric twenty-seven, of the old Ritual, as well as in the new one, directions are given for baptizing two or more infants at the same time. We are instructed that certain prayers must be pluralized and the proper gender observed, while some rites must be repeated over each child baptized ("Si vero fuerint plures baptizandi . . . omnia pariter dicantur ut supra, in proprio genere, et numero plurali. Verum prima nominis interrogatio, exsufflatio . . . atque accensae candelae traditio, singulariter singulis . . . fieri debent"). In the Excerpt of the Roman Ritual, which for years has been in common use in the United States, we frequently find inserted for the greater convenience of priests, the instructions "singulariter singulis" and "in plurali pro pluribus." The Sacred Congregation of Rites has now formally recognized and approved this practice, since rubric twenty-seven, just quoted, has received the following addition: "Sed nos pro majori commoditate adnotavimus in propriis locis in rubricis parenthesi notatis; ita ut quando dicitur in tali rubrica: *Singulariter singulis*, intellige quod illa verba, vel actiones, usque ad aliam rubricam, dici vel fieri debent singulariter singulis, et primum masculis, deinde feminis, mutato solum genere, ut dictum est supra. Quando vero in simili rubrica: *In plurali pro omnibus*, intellige quod illa verba, usque ad aliam rubricam, dici debent semel, sed pro omnibus in plurali, mutato solo genere, si omnes sint feminae." In keeping with this new rubric we note frequently in the Ritual the directions "singulariter singulis" and "in plurali

pro omnibus," while occasionally another appears, as, for instance, "singulorum infantium," "singulos baptizandos," "sine mutatione pro omnibus."

Some few rubrics demand special mention. Thus rubric five in the chapter already quoted formerly read: "Deinde imponat manum super caput infantis ac dicat." The present reading contains two additions as follows: "Deinde imponat manum super caput infantis (*singulorum infantium*) ac *postea* dicat." Similar insertions have been made in rubric nine of the same chapter: "Mox imponit manum super caput infantis (*singulorum infantium*) et *postea* dicit." Like changes are found in parallel rubrics (Tit. II, c. 4, nn. 12, 17, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 28, 33, which numbers however do not correspond with those of the former Ritual) in the form prescribed for baptizing adults. In the rubrics *for supplying the ceremonies* in baptism the word *postea* is sometimes inserted (Tit. II, c. 2, § 1, 12; § 2, nn. 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, 32), sometimes omitted (l. c., § 1, n. 8; § 2, n. 9).

Practically, then, in the administration of baptism how does this new form of the rubrics affect us? First of all, rubricists have always agreed that *physical* contact of the minister's hand with the child's head was not required. There is nothing in the present wording of the rubric to contradict this opinion. *Moral* contact, or the holding of the hand above the child's head, still suffices. Secondly, without doubt the hand is to be extended over the head of *each* child, since the rubric in its new form, "singulariter singulis," is clear. Some argued in the past that it sufficed to extend the hand over all in common, as the imposition of the hand was not mentioned in rubric twenty-seven among the ceremonies to be repeated in the case of each child. Others on the contrary doubted the correctness of this conclusion, owing to the rubric in the Pontifical, which distinctly prescribed that the hand here be imposed "singulariter singulis." This, it would seem, should have been decisive, for the Pontifical (*Pro baptizmate parvulorum*, in fine) professes to give, each in its proper place, the directions which are combined in the above-mentioned number of the Ritual. Moreover there is no reason to suppose that this rite should vary when performed by a bishop. In regard to this point there is now absolute certainty. Thirdly, it was questioned in

the past whether the hand should remain extended throughout the prayer that follows. The few liturgists who thus far have given expression to their views on this matter, seemingly agree that the new rubric sheds no clearer light on this question. The almost universal practice formerly was to hold the hand extended either *toward* the child or directly *over* the child's head, till the prayer was finished. The word *postea* might easily have been understood in the former rubric, and we conclude that it exerts no definite influence in the interpretation of the new one.

The tenth rubric (Tit. II, c. 2) is given in the new Ritual thus: "Postea sacerdos imponit extremam partem stolae super infantem, et introducit eum (quem sequuntur ceteri) in Ecclesiam, dicens: N. ingredi," etc. It would appear then that even when several are baptized, the singular form *ingredere* should be retained, though we were accustomed, of course, in the past to say *ingredimini*. The Pontifical too insists on the plural form. Surely there can be no reason why the plural should not be employed. Be it noted moreover that in three places in the *editio typica* of the Ritual that we are considering the plural form *ingredimini* is found. In the baptism of adults (Tit. II, c. 4, n. 29) we have: "Dum autem sacerdos illum vel illos introducit, dicat (*in plurali pro pluribus*);" while for the supplying of the ceremonies for adults (Tit. II, c. 5 § 2, n. 28) the rubric is the same verbatim. Shall we maintain that the form should vary for adults? But better still in supplying the ceremonies for infants (Tit. II, c. 5 § 1) the thirteenth rubric is put thus: "Postea sacerdos imponit extremam partem stolae super primum infantem, et introducit eum (quem sequuntur ceteri) in Ecclesiam, dicens (*in plurali pro omnibus*)."
Quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus. May we not rightly conclude then that the parenthesis, containing the phrase "*in plurali pro omnibus*," was inadvertently omitted in the rubric under consideration? At any rate in practice, when baptizing two or more, we must assume its presence, and employ the plural verb *ingredimini*.

In the prayer recited in giving the white veil: "Accipe vestem candidam, quam immaculatam perferas," etc., the last two words quoted are transposed ("quam perferas immaculatam"). The next prayer, which is said in presenting the

candle, has lost the phrase "*habeasque vitam aeternam*," doubtless because redundant ("*Accipe lampadem . . . ut . . . possis occurrere ei una cum omnibus Sanctis in aula coelesti, et vivas in saecula saeculorum. Amen*"). Furthermore these two prayers now appear word for word in the form for baptizing adults, which previously was not the case. Finally in rubric twenty-six the plural, as well as the singular, number is given: N. "*Vade (Ite) in pace, et Dominus sit tecum (vobiscum). R. Amen.*"

The fifth chapter in the old Ritual (*Ordo supplendi omnia super baptizatum*) was exceedingly brief, reference merely being made for the most part to the prayers and rubrics of the previous chapters. This chapter however in the late edition of the Ritual extends over twenty pages, since all the matter required is given in its entirety. It is moreover divided into two paragraphs, of which the first refers to the supplying of ceremonies in the case of infants, while the second relates to adults.

HOLY COMMUNION.

Formerly the antiphon, *O Sacrum Convivium*, after the distribution of Holy Communion outside Mass, was optional; now it is obligatory. The rubric reads: "*sacerdos reversus ad altare dicit*," whereas the old rubric had "*dicere poterit*." Let us mention in passing that the reading is "*reversus ad altare*" and not "*revertens*," as the practice of some would indicate. The prayer, *Spiritus nobis*, which in Paschal time is substituted in giving Communion extra Missam for the more usual prayer, *Deus, qui nobis*, and which had the short termination "*Per Christum Dominum nostrum*," now has the long ending "*Per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum*," etc. Throughout the octave of Corpus Christi as well as in Paschal time, an alleluia is added to the *O Sacrum Convivium*, to the versicle *Panem de coelo* and to the response *Omne delectamentum* (unless the celebrant is in black vestments; S. R. C., n. 3465). The same is true of the versicle and its response, during the same periods, when Communion is administered to the sick.

Formerly there was a lack of uniformity in giving the blessing after the distribution of Holy Communion extra Missam. The Ritual (Tit. IV, c. 2, n. 9) stated simply: "*Deinde ex-*

tena manu dextera, benedicit iis qui communicarunt, dicens." After closing the tabernacle, the priest, according to the more general practice, turned immediately, with hands joined, toward the people, blessing them, while saying the prescribed form. Others, however, preferred to raise their hands and eyes before facing the congregation, as is prescribed in giving the blessing at Mass. Wishing to do away with this disparity, the Holy See has left no room for doubt in the present wording of her regulations. "Postea genuflectens reponit Sacramentum in tabernaculo, et clave obserat. *Deinde elevatis oculis, extendens, elevans et jungens manus, caputque cruci inclinans dicit:* 'Benedictio Dei omnipotentis,' et versus ad populum semel tantum benedicens prosequitur 'Patris ✠ et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, descendat super vos, et maneat semper. R. Amen.'" The new rubric adds furthermore: "Et ita iis, qui communicarunt, benedicit sacerdos tam extra Missam, quam ante vel post ipsam." It is to be understood, nevertheless, that this blessing is omitted before or after Mass, when black vestments are worn. Aside then from kissing the altar, our movements in giving this blessing are the same as at Mass. The words of course are different. We beg to note that the distribution of Holy Communion immediately before or after a *High* Mass is forbidden, since the Sacred Congregation of Rites gave a *negative* answer 19 January, 1906 (n. 4177 ad III) to the following query: "An sacerdos, sacris vestibus Sacrificii indutus, possit administrare Sacram Communionem, data rationabili causa, ante vel post Missam solemnem aut cantatam aut etiam conventualem, sicuti permittitur ante vel post Missam privatam?"

The decrees of the Sacred Congregation of the Council, issued under Pius X, in regard to the reception of Holy Communion by sick persons, under certain conditions, when not fasting, are found in the First Appendix of the Ritual on pages 12* and 13*. In the communion of the sick, even *ex devotione*, the Misereatur and Indulgentiam are given (Tit. IV, c. 4, n. 14) in the singular number, in keeping with a decree of the Congregation of Rites under date of 16 November, 1906. The prayer Deus, qui nobis, when said at the altar on returning from the sickroom, takes the short ending, instead of the long one, as previously.

The heading on page 11* of the First Appendix *Modus Sacram Eucharistiam deferendi occulte ad infirmos* is now found without the final words *ob metum infidelium*, while reference to the Turks is omitted in the instructions. The authority cited is not merely as before, Benedict XIV, but also a decree of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments which was published 23 December, 1912.

A question not infrequently arising in the United States of late years relates to the receiving of Holy Communion according to a rite to which the communicant does not belong. We deem it advisable to insert verbatim the instruction of the Church, as set forth on page 11* of the Ritual, in this important matter.

DE SACRA COMMUNIONE PROMISCOUO RITU SUSCIPienda.

juxta Constitutionem Apostolicam *Tradita ab antiquis*
diei 14 Sept. 1912.

1. Sacris promiscuo ritu operari Sacerdotibus ne liceat: propterea suae quisque Ecclesiae ritu Sacramentum Corporis Domini conficiant et ministrent.

2. Ubi necessitas urgeat, nec Sacerdos diversi ritus adsit, licebit Sacerdoti orientali, qui fermentato utitur, ministrare Eucharistiam consecratam in azymo, vicissim latino aut orientali, qui utitur azymo, ministrare in fermentato: at suum quisque ritum ministrandi servabit.

3. Omnibus fidelibus cujusvis ritus datur facultas, ut, pietatis causa, Sacramentum Eucharisticum quolibet ritu confectum suscipiant.

4. Quisque fidelium praecepto Communionis paschalis ita satisfaciet, si eam suo ritu accipiat.

5. Sanctum Viaticum moribundis ritu proprio de manibus proprii parochi accipiendum est: sed, urgente necessitate, fas esto a sacerdote quolibet illud accipere; qui tamen ritu suo ministrabit.

MATRIMONY.

The milder word *hortetur* has been substituted for *moneat* in rubric fourteen (Tit. VII, c. 1), while a new rubric (15) prescribes that the contracting parties be exhorted to receive the nuptial blessing at their marriage, or, when omitted at that time, as soon after as possible. We may note that in this latter case the presence of both husband and wife is required when this blessing is imparted (S. R. C., 27 May, 1911, n. 4269, VII), though the blessing is intended chiefly for the

woman. A woman however may not receive this blessing twice. A widow to whom the nuptial blessing has not been given in connexion with her first marriage, may be married with a Mass in which the blessing is imparted, though the other party to the contract, a widower, may have previously shared in the nuptial blessing. These regulations which were found in the old Ritual still remain.

We append in full rubric fifteen :

Sciat nihilominus, hanc benedictionem semper impertiendam esse in matrimoniis catholicorum, infra tamen Missae celebrationem juxta rubricas et extra tempus feriatum, omnibus illis conjugibus, qui eam in contrahendo matrimonio quacumque ex causa non obtinuerint, etiamsi petant postquam diu in matrimonio vixerint; immo illos hortandos esse, ut eam primo quoque tempore petant, simul tamen admonendos, maxime si neophyti sint, vel ante conversionem ab haeresi valide contraxerint, benedictionem ipsam ad ritum et solemnitatem, non vero ad substantiam et validitatem pertinere conjugii (Decr. S. R. et U. Inq. 31 Aug. 1881).

Occasionally in proclaiming the banns of matrimony a priest fails to state to what parishes the contracting parties belong, and whether it is the first, second or third announcement. These details, as well as one or two others, are still obligatory, as they have been for centuries, in accordance with the thirteenth rubric of the present chapter. Finally rubric sixteen has been expunged as its chief contents are embodied in the new one quoted above.

EXTREME UNCTION.

Naturally the new Ritual contains the short form of Extreme Unction, which the Holy Office on 25 April, 1906, declared to be sufficient in urgent cases for the validity of the sacrament. The changes demanded by the feminine gender in prayers and versicles are given in parenthesis. A similar arrangement will be observed throughout the whole of the fifth title, which comprises not only Extreme Unction, but the visitation of the sick and prayers for the dying, as well as in other parts of the Ritual. In other places, as in the title *De exequiis*, changes in number as well as in gender are noted. Why this plan is not observed universally, in baptism for example, is not ap-

parent. *Famula* is given as the feminine of *famulus*, while *servus* becomes *ancilla*.

PRAYERS FOR THE DYING.

In the prayers for the dying (*Ordo commendationis animae*) there is an insertion in the *Proficiscere*. After the words "in nomine Spiritus Sancti, qui in te effusus est", we find: "in nomine gloriosae et sanctae Dei Genitricis Virginis Mariae". Reference to the Blessed Virgin is likewise inserted in the prayer *Commendo te*, after the phrase "et beatae quietis in sinu Patriarcharum te complexus astringat," thus "sancta Dei Genitrix Maria suos benigna oculos ad te convertat." Lastly, immediately following the prayer *Delicta juventutis* a new and beautiful prayer, directed to the Mother of God, is given us in these words:

ORATIO.

Clementissima Virgo Dei Genitrix Maria, maerentium piissima consolatrix, famuli (*vel* famulae) hujus N. Spiritum Filio suo commendet, ut hoc materno interventu terrores mortis non timeat; sed desideratam caelestis patriae mansionem, ea comite, laetus (*vel* laeta) adeat. R. Amen.

OFFICE OF THE DEAD.

The first rubric in the Office of the Dead (Tit. VI, c. 4) has been enlarged. We are instructed to duplicate the antiphons not only on the occasions which were specified in the old Ritual, but likewise "in die post acceptum mortis nuntium . . . et anniversario etiam lato sumpto, et quoties solemniter celebratur Officium." Moreover in parenthesis is added: "Psalmi incipiuntur ut infra notatur, etiam quando non duplicantur antiphonae." We naturally expect the rules of Pius X for the reformation of the Divine Office to be observed in the Ritual. Hence we are not surprised to find the extra psalms in Lauds deleted, and the rules inserted which govern the interruption of the Office immediately after Matins. Since however three prayers, which are the same as those in the *Missa quotidiana* of the Missal, are now prescribed in the Office of the Dead *per annum*, all three must be recited, if this Office is interrupted at the end of Matins. The prayer for the deceased parent or parents of the celebrant, to which we are accustomed in the Missal, has found its way into the Ritual.

Rubrics are inserted at the end of Vespers to the effect that the "Requiem aeternam" and its versicle are always said in the *plural*, and the final "Requiescant in pace," it is noted, is sung by the *chanters*. A new rubric in Matins instructs us how to begin this hour, also when the Invitatorium is to be said or omitted, and which nocturn, if only one is recited, is prescribed. The second antiphon of Vespers begins with the words "Heu me," a change from "Hei mihi," which fact we had already learned from the Vatican edition of the Vespers. A note at the bottom of page 140 of the Ritual informs us that all prayers (orations) in *Exequiis et in Officio Defunctorum* may be sung either in the usual ferial tone (*recto tono*) or in what is now called *tonus ferialis ad libitum*. For the inflections in this latter, which is likewise styled *tonus antiquus simplex*, the reader is referred to the last edition of the Cantorinus, or to the Vatican edition either of the Vespers or of the Office for the Dead.

We take occasion here to state that the Ritual meets the latest requirements from a musical viewpoint, corresponding with the Vatican edition of liturgical books which were published by Pope Pius X. Many of our choirs are not yet familiar with this style of Gregorian chant.

AFTER THE ABSOLUTION.

Rubric fifteen (Tit. VI, c. 3) is given thus: "Deinde a sepultura in ecclesiam vel in sacristiam revertentes, dicant sine cantu antiphonam *Si iniquitates*, cum psalmo *De profundis*," etc. This rubric remains as it was. Would that it had been made clearer, or that more specific instructions were given elsewhere, in accordance with the tenor of the subjoined decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (11 March 1899, n. 4014): "Utrum in reditu in sacristiam, absolutione ad tumultum expleta, in officiis et Missis cum cantu pro uno vel pluribus defunctis die septima, trigesima et anniversaria, aut etiam extra has dies celebratis, dici debeat: *Anima ejus* (vel *animae eorum*), etc. et antiphona: *Si iniquitates* cum psalmo *De profundis* et oratione *Fidelium Deus*? Affirmative, juxta Missale Romanum et decreta diei 28 Julii 1832 (n. 2694) et 31 Augusti 1872 (n. 2696, ad 2)." A later decree (20 August 1901, n. 4081) in answer to a query states: "Psalmus cum anti-

phona *Si iniquitates* dicatur in reditu ad sacristiam, in qua deinde persolventur preces *Kyrie*, etc. cum oratione *Fidelium*, etc."

A Missal at hand, printed in 1913, not only gives the rubric above, as found in the Ritual, for funerals, but also *In Absolutione supra tumulum* it has among other directions: "Quibus expeditis, omnes in sacristiam, Cruce praecedente, revertentes, voce submissa, sed intelligibili celebrans dicit *Si iniquitates*; inde alternatim cum choro psalmus *De profundis* et in fine *Requiem aeternam dona eis, Domine*, et repetita antiphona *Si iniquitates*, etc. subjungit." Here are printed in full the *Kyrie*, versicles, *Fidelium*, finishing with "*Requiem aeternam, Et lux perpetua, Requiescant in pace. Amen.*"

Liturgists consequently now agree that, except on All Souls' Day or at other times when the services are for *All* the Faithful Departed, the above mentioned prayers, that is, the *De profundis* with its antiphon, versicles, *Kyrie*, prayer *Fidelium Deus, Requiem aeternam*, etc. are to be recited (not sung) by the celebrant and his assistants after the *absolution*, whether the occasion be a funeral, month's mind, anniversary, or other service. When, at a funeral, the service is not terminated in the church, but at the grave, the *De profundis* is recited while the procession is returning to the church. Whether the service terminates in the church or in the cemetery, the *Kyrie*, versicles and *Fidelium*, etc., as above, are recited after arrival in the sacristy. This may necessitate an interruption after the antiphon at the close of the *De profundis*.

PROCESSIONS AND LITANIES.

In preparing for the procession on Corpus Christi a *cleric*, and not the *deacon* as formerly, puts the veil on the celebrant's shoulders. It is no longer prescribed that the celebrant stand on the highest step of the altar while receiving the Blessed Sacrament from the deacon, nor is he instructed to ascend to the platform after having received the monstrance. All these changes are noted in rubric three (Tit. IX, c. 5). Nothing is said about the position of the celebrant while restoring the monstrance to the deacon after the procession.

In processions *pro gratiarum actione* (Tit. IX, c. 13) each of the psalms 148, 149 and 150 has the *Gloria Patri* and *Sicut*

erat, whereas the doxology was recited previously only after the last.

In the Litany which is recited in the time of war (Tit. IX, c. 11), reference in rubric two to Turks, infidels or heretics is omitted, while the invocation: "Ut Turcarum (vel haereticorum) conatus reprimere, et ad nihilum redigere digneris," is repressed. In the last prayer the expression "gentes Turcarum (seu haereticorum)" becomes "hostes nostri."

The invocation "per sanctissimae Eucharistiae institutionem tuam" which had been *permitted* by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, 8 February, 1905, is now inserted in the Litany of the Holy Name of Jesus. The Litany of St. Joseph, approved 18 March, 1909, finds a place in the Ritual. At the close of the Litany of the Blessed Virgin, in which is inserted "Mater boni consilii," instructions are given for the selection of the versicle, response and prayer, according to the different periods of the ecclesiastical year. In the special Litany for the Forty Hours, which is printed in the Ritual on page 14* *for use in the City of Rome*, reference to the Turks and heretics is omitted. This Litany varies somewhat in the order of the invocations from the one ordinarily used, while it still retains the petition "Ab imminentibus periculis," which is not recited elsewhere. Chanters to avoid confusion should be careful to have the same text.

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

Certain blessings that have been approved of late years may now be found in the Ritual. Thus in the First Appendix we have blessings for a printing office and presses, a vehicle, a bell for church use (this is a blessing by a priest, without the Sacred Oils), and one that is not for such use, an ambulance, a fire-engine, fishing boat. In the Second Appendix a long blessing of water on the Vigil of the Epiphany is added, while the decree of the Holy Office, referring to the nuptial blessing, which formerly was given there, is now omitted. The substance of this decree is embodied in the new rubric (15), quoted above under the heading Matrimony.

Many minor changes in the Ritual are rather in the nature of corrections. Thus in the prayer, Aeternam ac justissimam, in supplying the ceremonies in the baptism of adults, we have

"eum illuminare," (instead of "illum"), as it is in the form of baptism itself. The word "*eodem* (Spiritu Sancto)" is inserted in the ending of the prayer Domine Deus after the administration of Extreme Unction, "eundem" in the conclusion of the prayer for the blessing of bees. In the Apostolic Blessing in *articulo mortis* we find *et* inserted after *Pater* (*Pater et Filius*). The prayers Omnipotens sempiterne Deus in the burial service for infants, and Deus, invictae virtutis in the blessing of sacerdotal vestments have the short conclusion. In many blessings the versicle Domine, exaudi with its response is wanting, while in the blessing of water for the sick the "Dominus vobiscum" is added. In the antiphon, Cum appropinquaret in the procession of Palm Sunday "sternebant" becomes "exsternebant," while the antiphon Ante sex dies loses the last word "tuae." The sign of the cross ✠ in the form of blessing has been added in some places, and removed in others. Where it was found three times, as for example in the blessing of water in honor of St. Vincent Ferrer, it is now usually given only once in the final blessing, and then nearly always after the word "Patris."

In the blessing of the Scapular of the Blessed Virgin *de mercede*, "tegimen" becomes "tegumen." In the form for the Five Scapulars in place of "sine labe conceptae doloresque tuos ac vices peramanter dolentis," we now have the shorter expression: "sub titulo *Immaculatae Conceptionis, Septem Dolorum*," while the phrase "quibus praedicti Ordines seu Congregationes pollent" has become "quae per Sanctae Sedis privilegia praedictis Scapularibus concessae sunt." After the words "bonorum spiritualium" is added "horum Ordinum seu Congregationum." Finally the word "coronae" is substituted for "rosarii" in the blessing of the rosary in honor of St. Joseph.

CONCLUSION.

To sum up the more practical points of the present article we would urge the use of the *editio typica* of the Ritual, to the exclusion of others; uniformity in the manner of giving the blessing after Holy Communion outside Mass, and in the recitation of the prayers after the Absolution at the catafalque; the use of chanters of uniform text and musical notation in

Processions, Litanies, Office of the Dead, etc. We would likewise direct attention to the prohibition of distributing Holy Communion immediately before or after a High Mass, to the altered form of the last prayers in conferring baptism, to slight changes in enrolling in the Five Scapulars, to the additional invocation in the Litany of the Holy Name.

A. B. MEEHAN.

St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

THE PRIEST'S TABLE.

They are as sick that surfeit with too much, as they that starve with nothing.—*Shakespeare.*

An intelligent friend of mine recently remarked: "I think a man ought to eat what he wants to eat."—"Yes," I replied, "provided he wants to eat what he ought to eat."—*Pearce Kintzing, M.D.*

Be not greedy in any feasting . . . for in many meats there will be sickness, and greediness will turn to choler. By surfeiting many have perished: but he that is temperate shall prolong life.—*Eccles. 37: 32-34.*

ONE clerical adage that is safe never to become obsolete, or to lapse, at least in sacerdotal circles, into innocuous desuetude, is: "After all, priests are men, not angels." As used by clerics, it is scarcely necessary to remark, the saying is not so much a disavowal of any pretensions to such qualities as in profane literature and in ordinary conversation are commonly ascribed to angels—beauty, brightness, innocence, and unusual graciousness of manner and kindness of heart—as it is a denial of any freedom or exemption from the passions and appetites and temptations to which the average human being is subject. Yes; a priest is a man, not only in the zoological sense that he is "a featherless plantigrade biped mammal of the genus *Homo*", but in the theological one that he is "a rational animal"; and some of us are perhaps inclined to think that in our own case the last word of the theological definition may well receive the greater emphasis. Without going so far as to endorse the opinion of the flippant essayist who asserts that "Man was created a little lower than the angels—and has been getting a little lower ever since", we are all acutely conscious that the animal part of us, our body, is a stubborn fact of which even the most aspiring and ascetic soul must perforce make considerable account. Not the least insistent and self-assertive organ of this material body of ours is the

stomach, and accordingly one matter which neither the priest nor any other non-angelic, mundane being can afford to disregard is the question of food.

If it were at all necessary to proffer any apology for discussing in such a periodical as this so material, gross, vulgar, unesthetic and unascetic a subject as mere eating and drinking, one might take high philosophical ground and quote Plato to the effect that: "The man of understanding will be far from yielding to brutal or irrational pleasures—but he will always be desirous of preserving the harmony of the body for the sake of the concord of the soul." If the dictum of the Grecian philosopher be considered insufficient to indue the subject with congruous dignity, the following somewhat grandiloquent paragraph of an American physician will perhaps be thought adequate: "The history of man's diet is the history of the human race. It is the story of his evolvement from the lowest forms of savagery to his present pinnacle. It begins with the cave-dweller, gnawing with wolf-like fangs at a joint of raw bear-meat, and ends with the potentate drinking champagne from a golden chalice. It is the history of oppression and tyranny, and of independence and freedom; of political growth and conquest, and of barbarian invasion and desolation; of health and wealth, of poverty and disease." Putting aside both the philosopher and the physician, however, we prefer to justify the appearance of the present paper in a magazine for priests on the entirely sufficient grounds sung by Owen Meredith:

We may live without poetry, music, and art;
We may live without conscience and live without heart;
We may live without friends; we may live without books;
But civilized man cannot live without cooks.
He may live without books—what is knowledge but grieving?
He may live without hope—what is hope but deceiving?
He may live without love—what is passion but pining?
But where is the man that can live without dining?

It may be urged of course, and not without some specious force, that, granting the real importance of the subject of food and nutrition, still, since the clerical stomach is not different from the layman's, the number of volumes that have already been written on the subject and the endless series of articles dealing with it that are constantly appearing in the

magazines and newspapers give all necessary information thereon, and render quite superfluous any specific discussion of the priest's table as differentiated from any one else's. The point, however, is only partially well taken. In the matter of eating, and especially in that of abstaining from eating, the priest's life differs not a little from that of the layman in a number of respects, and hence there are some counsels peculiarly appropriate to him, though not of general applicability. The great majority of priests, for instance, fast until about noon on Sundays and on occasional week-days because of their saying a late Mass. The necessity of such fasting may well affect their usual attitude toward food during the other days of the week. Many persons, most persons perhaps, call one of their three daily meals their favorite or best meal. They come to it with better appetite, and eat more abundantly than is the case at their other repasts. With some it is breakfast, with others the midday dinner, and with still others the evening supper. Now, no matter how it may be with the layman, the cleric who has to fast on Sundays is surely making a dietetic mistake if he habitually takes a hearty breakfast on week-days. "The digestive system, when in proper running order," says Dr. Henry Smith Williams, "is wonderfully clock-like in its operations, and to disturb the regularity of its activities once in seven days is not conducive to health or happiness."

Common sense, apart from any medical pronouncement, teaches the same lesson. It clearly stands to reason that the less sustenance I habitually take on ordinary mornings, the less derangement there will be when I take none at all on Sunday mornings, and accordingly the less danger of my suffering from headaches and other discomforts experienced by very many priests who observe the dominical fast. It is pertinent to add that the change from a hearty breakfast to a light one, or even a very light one, can be effected without any considerable inconvenience. The stomach, like most other organs of the body, soon learns to accommodate itself to new habits that are not in themselves injurious; but it registers decided objections to irregularity in the treatment accorded to it. Those members of some of our religious orders who fast habitually every morning apparently enjoy as good health and are capable of as efficient service as those of us who like our "three

square meals " a day ; and very probably most readers of this page have learned from their personal experience during more than one Lenten season that, after the first week or ten days, habitual fasting is conducive to general well-being rather than to physical discomfort or distress.

As for another practical point in connexion with the clerical table, a distinction must be made between such priests as live alone, or at least eat alone, and such as have permanent boarders in the persons of curates or assistants. If I am living by myself, it is clearly my right (within the bounds of Christian temperance) to eat and drink whatever I like. If it is my duty to provide meals for others besides myself, it is just as clearly *not* my right to impose upon them my personal dietetic whims and caprices either as to the kind, or quality, or quantity of the food to be taken. A pastor may be thoroughly convinced that fruit and uncooked cereals, with a cup of coffee, constitute the best possible breakfast for any one, young or old ; but his conviction does not warrant his withholding from his robust assistant (who conceivably classes cereals with sawdust) the ham or bacon or chops or steak to which that young man has been accustomed and without which he feels insufficiently nourished. So, too, with the variety recommended by all medical men in the matter of foods. The traditional French complaint, *toujours perdrix* (always partridges), is universally recognized as being well grounded. The most palatable and succulent dishes, if served day after day, will pall upon the appetite and become distasteful. Good roast beef is no doubt excellent food, but even a pastor's especial fondness for it is hardly a sufficient reason for his forcing it upon an assistant six or seven times a week.

On the other hand, it is quite possible that assistants may be fully as whimsical about their diet as are some pastors. It is not an unheard-of thing for a critical curate to complain of being half-starved at a table which is plentifully supplied with good, plain, substantial food, and to imply that porterhouse steak for breakfast and roast turkey for dinner should be the usual thing at least several times a week. In all probability he was not accustomed to that sort of diet in his boyhood at home, and it is more than probable that he had to put up with a much simpler, less expensive regimen during his sojourn

at college and seminary. Exceptional cases aside, a pastor is quite warranted in supposing that his table is adequately supplied when it is abundantly furnished with several of the numerous varieties of food that by the common consent of mankind have been voted wholesome. Altogether exaggerated importance is too often attributed to this dictum of Lucretius: "Different food is pleasant and nutritious for different creatures; that which to some is nauseous and bitter may yet to others seem passing sweet; and the discrepancy is so great that what to one man is food, to another is rank poison." While the statement contains no doubt a modicum of truth, it may well be qualified by this declaration of an oldtime American physician, Dr. Austin Flint: "I have never known a person to become a faddist regarding diet without also becoming a dyspeptic."

This mention of faddists suggests a reference to the large number of people in both lay and clerical circles who deny themselves this, that, or the other kind of food because, as they say, it doesn't agree with them. A medical authority of considerable prestige in the scientific world, the Dr. Williams already quoted, thinks that this notion is very often a mistaken one. The particular variety of food in question may have been taken at a time when anything would have disagreed with the eater, or it may have been taken in excessive quantity. "It is worth while," he says, "to make very sure before you deny yourself what may really be a useful and pleasant article of food on the ground of personal idiosyncrasy." So, too, with the refusal of many persons to take certain kinds of food because of a distaste for them. The distaste may be the result of some unpleasant experience under exceptional circumstances. The present writer, for instance, conceived some years ago a genuine disgust for lobsters, and for a long time refused to partake of that excellent crustacean, simply because of a visit paid to a lobster factory in which the sanitary conditions were not of the best and the stench was of the rankest. Let him hasten to add that an attempt to give him, as a boy, a distaste for his favorite berry by administering his periodical spring-time powders or pills through the medium of strawberry preserves resulted in ignominious failure. Yielding to aversions that may easily be overcome in the matter of food is a mistake,

and very frequently one that entails considerable inconvenience. To be able to eat with relish all kinds of common foods that are set before him at home or elsewhere is not only a blessing for which priest or layman may well be thankful, but a capacity which the normally healthy individual may easily acquire.

All general rules of course suffer exceptions, and so, while it is generally true that what is wholesome for one healthy person is wholesome for another, a man is not necessarily a hypochondriac or a valetudinarian because he affirms that such or such an article of food does not agree with him, or that such another is distasteful to him. If his own experience, not infrequently repeated, has unequivocally taught him that his indulgence in a particular dish invariably produces stomachic disorders, common sense dictates his avoidance of that dish. As to the whole question of diet, indeed, there is more truth than extravagance in the dictum: "At thirty-five a man is his own physician or a fool." When one has reached that age his familiarity with the effects of this or that dietary on his personal health and well-being ought to be a sufficiently safe guide in choosing the edibles that constitute his meals. At the same time he should be chary of excluding from his bill of fare any staple article of food simply because, once or twice, and perhaps under exceptional conditions, it has affected him disagreeably. While the proof of the pudding may be in the eating, it can hardly be considered conclusive proof unless the particular kind of pudding has been eaten more than once or twice or thrice.

On the whole, however, priests, like other people, probably injure their internal economy, and as a consequence the efficiency of their labors, more by eating the things they like than by abstaining from those they dislike. Scarcely if at all less than the laity, the clergy are concerned in this fact un-animously affirmed by the world's best physicians: "gastronomic errors are among the most wide-spread of man's sins, and the penalties he pays therefor are from the nature of the case not merely expiative but retributory; not merely penitential, but punitive, since often 'the wages of sin is death'". In so far as priests, and more particularly middle-aged and elderly priests, are concerned, these gastronomic errors may

be succinctly expressed in the statement that they partake too often of the wrong kinds of food, and eat too much of the right kinds. Nor is there any intention whatever on the part of the writer, in making this statement, of implying that the clergy (himself included) are given to even the lesser degrees of the sin of gluttony. Most of our transgressions in this respect are errors of judgment rather than wilful violations of the moral law. That the errors are quasi-universal would seem to be the opinion of standard dietetic authorities, since they assert that "we all eat about a third too much".

Without going into any more or less technical discussion of the quantitative and qualitative values of nitrogenous and non-nitrogenous foods, or of the correct proportions of proteins, carbohydrates, and fats in our ordinary meals, there are some outstanding common-sense principles that should be taken account of in the matter of determining what we shall eat. One of these is that both the kind and the quantity of the food we take should vary somewhat according to the nature of our habitual activities. The sedentary man engaged in mental work and the day-laborer whose exertion is purely muscular evidently do not require the same diet, and if they habitually take the same kind and quantity of food, one of the two will be committing a gastronomic sin. Father Clarence, who spends his forenoon between his office and his study, attending to his correspondence, or reading, clearly does not need as full a dinner of meat, eggs, milk, cheese, or leguminous vegetables as does his man Mike whose forenoon has been devoted to sawing wood, shoveling coal, or digging in the field or garden. And if, nevertheless, Father Clarence indulged in so hearty a dinner, elementary knowledge of physiology should teach him that it is incumbent upon him to take a considerable amount of physical exercise before again sitting down to eat. It ought to be axiomatic that, if the body is to be kept in a healthy condition, some sort of a nutritional equilibrium must be established, that there should be some proportion between the output of heat and energy and the intake of food, since, after all, the principal if not the sole purpose of food is to replace in our body the matter absorbed by the functions of life and the exertions of labor.

It may prove not uninteresting to enumerate here several of the propositions which United States scientists commonly use as factors in computing the results of systematic dietary studies.—propositions based largely upon experimental data. Given that a man at moderately active muscular work needs in a certain period thirty ounces of food, then a man at hard muscular work needs in the same period thirty-six ounces, one at light muscular work needs twenty-seven ounces, and one at a sedentary occupation needs only twenty-four ounces. On this basis the priest's man Mike, of the preceding paragraph, would need one and a half times as much dinner as the priest himself; and it would clearly be a dietetic indiscretion for Father Clarence to reverse the proportion and eat one and a half times as much as Mike. And yet it is questionable whether the clergy form any exception to Franklin's rule. "In general, mankind, since the improvement of cookery, eat twice as much as nature requires." There seems to be no good reason for doubting the statement made by any number of medical practitioners, that for every person who in our day and country dies from insufficient nutrition, starvation, there are at least a dozen or a score whose death is the indirect, and very often the direct, result of overeating. Voltaire is not an author who commends himself particularly to clerical readers; but the most orthodox priest will hardly quarrel with these precepts of that arch-infidel: "Regimen is better than physic. Every one should be his own physician.—Eat with moderation what you know by experience to agree with your constitution.—Nothing is good for the body but what we can digest. What can procure digestion? Exercise."

Eating the wrong kind of food is not perhaps so prevalent a gastronomic error, among clerics or others, as eating too much of the right kinds; but it is an existent error, nevertheless. If we have not personally proved this in our own experience (as in all probability most of us now and then *have* proved it), we have at least verified the statement in our observation of others. Memory forthwith supplies the present writer with several notable examples. To mention only one: Father Michael, an exemplary cleric of three and a quarter score years, had during a considerable number of those years been afflicted with stomach troubles. Reiterated experiences had

convinced him that eating meat at his supper was the forerunner of inevitable distress throughout the night and the following day; and accordingly as a rule he abstained therefrom. Now and then, however, when his digestive apparatus had been functioning nicely for a week or two, and when on the supper-table there appeared a variety of meat to which he was partial — cold turkey or country sausage, for instance — he would allow himself to be persuaded to take "just a small piece, a mere mouthful". The said mouthful being consumed, he would remark: "Do you know, that is really delicious. I think I'll take a little more", and would proceed to do so, with considerable present satisfaction no doubt, but a satisfaction as short-lived as his subsequent discomfort was protracted. Who has not known such a dietetic blunderer? "We eat," writes a medical author, "not to supply our needs, but satiate our appetites. We are wofully lacking in the strength of mind necessary to deny ourselves those things which experience has proved to be objectionable, much less to practise general and protracted self-denial, until grim admonition from within drives us thereto."

It is worth while to remark that the men who, like Father Michael, receive this "grim admonition from within" immediately, or soon, after their making a gastronomic blunder, are on the whole more fortunate than some others who continue for years to commit dietetic mistakes without receiving from their internal organs any decided protest. A recent writer on the smoking habit shrewdly declares that while excessive smoking, like gluttony, is harmful, the fact that the former works immediately is a wise provision of nature, since discontinuance leads to recovery, while immoderate eating tends to produce insidiously organic disturbances which may become irremediable before they are discovered and may not yield to better counsel and improved habits. So true is this, of the thirty-five thousand Americans who, according to our government reports, annually succumb to Bright's disease, fully one half, it is stated, are unaware that they have the disease at all until it is too late to arrest its progress. Undue concern about one's health is of course to be deprecated; and there is without a doubt something of truth in the familiar statement that the men who are always bothering about their physi-

cal well-being and taking infinite precautions as to diet, exposure to draughts, the temperature of their living rooms, etc., are precisely those who are most frequently ailing; but, on the other hand, it is incontestable that many men, and not a few middle-aged priests among them, habitually lead a life which, while not on the surface notably unsanitary, is nevertheless surely leading them to an untimely death. Those of us who in our fifth or sixth decade continue that habit of eating three hearty meals a day which we formed years ago when our physical activity was considerably greater than it is at present may well reflect on this last word of the scientists on Bright's disease: "Nine times out of ten it is the result, more or less direct, of disorders in the digestive tract, and nine times out of ten these disorders are due to too much eating and drinking, too much bending over desks, and too little fresh air."

Connected with our general subject there are one or two common fallacies that merit exposure. One of them is that an invariable relation of effect and cause exists between one's physical appearance and one's prowess with the knife and fork, that leanness, quasi-emaciation, skin-and-boneness are always due to abstemiousness, while plumpness of form and, *a fortiori*, obesity are certain signs of over-indulgence in the pleasures of the table. Leanness and its opposite are sometimes hereditary; and history as well as personal observation proves that there have been, and are, obese saints and thin gluttons. St. Thomas Aquinas was not particularly sylph-like in form, nor was that uncanonized nineteenth-century saint, the author of *All For Jesus*. A diocesan cleric, during a visit to a monastery in which one of his brothers was a religious, remarked one day: "Say, Tom, what a thoroughly mortified, saint-like, ascetic face your Father X has!"—"Ascetic fiddlesticks," came the entirely frank if not very charitable reply, "he's the most confirmed dyspeptic crank in the Community. Our real saint is Father L. over there in the corner, that rolypoly individual who looks like an over-fed alderman, and yet eats less in a week than Father X. does in a day." General rules are subject to so many exceptions that it is not always safe to apply them to particular cases.

Another specious fallacy about eating, or dieting, is that persons who fast, either habitually or occasionally, take as

much food at their one full meal as they would take in their three regular meals if they were not fasting. In all probability those who make this statement do not really believe it, themselves. In any case, priests who have frequent experience of fasting must know that the assertion is so far from being true that it is simply ridiculous. If it ever wears any color of truth it must be in the case of the person who fasts only once in a long while, and whose stomach has accordingly not become habituated to the changed regime. In the present writer's own case, and he ventures to say, in that of the average man who has adopted the plan of taking only one full meal a day, that meal is not a bit fuller now than it was some years ago when it was daily supplemented by two other hearty repasts. Apropos of habitual fasting, by the way, George Fordyce declares: "One meal a day is enough for a lion, and it ought to be for a man,"—at least for a man whose life is largely an indoor, sedentary one, and who takes little or no physical exercise.

An excellent concomitant of an enjoyable meal, and one that should never be absent from a table at which several priests are gathered, is lively conversation. It may seem somewhat rash to question the advantages of the oldtime monastic plan of eating in silence, the diners listening to a reader instead of talking among themselves; but the advantages are perhaps spiritual rather than hygienic. At any rate, where no rule forbids talking at table, the said monastic plan may assuredly be improved upon. For one thing, animated conversation during meals militates against our committing the typically American dietetic sin,—eating too rapidly, bolting one's food rather than masticating it thoroughly. Apart from this worth-while result, lively speech and intermittent laughter are effective aids to digestion. There are many places, no doubt, in which diocesan priests may congruously and profitably practise "the great silence" to which their religious confrères are often constrained; but the dining-room is not one of them.

The limitations imposed by the title of this essay obviously exclude a number of considerations which might appropriately enough find their place in a paper on the general subject of eating. It would, for instance, savor somewhat of impertinence

to insist that a priest is decidedly out of character in the rôle of either a gourmand or a gourmet, a greedy feeder or a nice one, a connoisseur in the delicacies of the table, an epicure. And it would be superfluous to point out that, more than other persons, he must "use as a frugal man the things that are set before him", and sedulously avoid giving any shadow of occasion for the imputation that "his god is his belly". It will not, however, be irrelevant to conclude with the description of what in the present writer's opinion is the best of clerical meals: one that has fresh air and active muscular exercise for an appetizer; plain, substantial, and well-cooked food for the bill of fare; and an accompaniment of pleasant, cheerful discourse from the first mouthful to the last.

ARTHUR BARRY O'NEILL, C.S.C.

Notre Dame, Indiana.

FRIARS AND MONKS IN MEDIAEVAL LITERATURE.

IT is almost a justification of Lucretian philosophy that we find from time to time things coming into the world which have distinct merits, which are accepted as antidotes to existing evils, which gain credence and power, which are over popularized, which often degenerate into mere formalities and distorted shadows of their former true selves, and which then stand in need of as vigorous reform as did the elements of human social life which they originally came to reform.

Thus in the early part of the thirteenth, which has been called "the greatest of centuries", we saw the rise and progress of the orders of preaching friars. They swept in a veritable whirlwind of reform over the face of Europe. They called layman and cleric alike to a more strict adherence to the teachings of Christ and to the preachings of the Christian Fathers. They carried a strong spiritual impulse into the very heart of religion. The threefold vow of Poverty, Chastity, and Obedience stood in the eyes of their contemporaries respectively for abandonment of the evils of the too worldly clerics who had preceded them, for surrender of all the common evils of lay life, and for solidarity in the accomplishment of the great mission which it was theirs to perform. As M. Jusserand has put it, "The popularity of the friars was immense, and it was

soon found that they had monopolized in England every thing that concerned religion.”¹ An evidence of the status of these men, who gradually became more and more stationary in their habits, as their numbers grew and the field for reform missionary work was gradually cut down,² is found in a bit of verse of the period which stands as an apt tribute to their merits:

Preste ne monke, ne yit chanoun,
 Ne no man of religious,
 Gyfen hem so to devocioun
 As done thes holy frers.
 For somme gyven ham to chyvalry,
 Somme to riote and ribaudery;
 But ffrers gyven ham to grete study,
 And to grete prayers.³

These are specific references to the hunting and hawking propensities of some ecclesiastics, to the degraded tavern life of others whom we have already noted. But the most significant fact here is the one stated by Jusserand, that the friars were monopolizing religious affairs in England. With the vigor and zeal of propagandists they were going out of their neighboring cloisters on trips, entering the fields of the parish priests, and competing against one another. This rivalry might have been a good incentive in the beginning of the movement; but at the end it was wasted energy. G. M. Trevelyan has drawn out of *Piers Plowman's Creed* the following generalization: “The dislike of the Franciscan for the Dominican, of the Dominican for the Augustinian, of the Augustinian for the Carmelite, was equalled only by the dislike of the parish priest for them all.”⁴

¹ *English Wayfaring Life of the Middle Ages*, p. 293.

² Part of the work of the friars lay in exploring hitherto unknown or remote parts of the globe, just as in later centuries the Jesuits carried the Christian religion and the flag of France into the wilds of North America. There was Friar John of Carpini and his companion Friar Benedict the Pole, who travelled in the Near East and among the Tartars meeting Batu, “the senior living member” of the family of Jenghez Khan, and Friar William Rubruk who went into Asia, and Friar Odoric the Franciscan—all of whom may be found mentioned in Hakluyt, and the charming accounts of their travels referred to.

³ Thos. Wright, *Political Poems*, vol. i, p. 263.

⁴ *England in the Age of Wiclif*, p. 145. Cf. *Piers Plowman*, (B. V. 143-152).

“Thus clerks of the church one another contemn,
 Till both are but beggars, and live by their begging.”

The situation was something like this. A lord had a difference, we will suppose, with the priest of his parish, who would refuse to grant an undeserved absolution. The lord then would turn for a more tractable confessor to the next wandering friar and secure the coveted absolution in one of three ways: by a downright money payment, by placing in the church or priory an elaborate stained-glass window,⁵ or even by establishing the "confessoure : coped as a frere" as his own permanent and dependable private chaplain. It is thus seen that the friars were a privileged order outside the ordinary ecclesiastical ranks, and that as time went on they abused those privileges which the intrinsic worth of their initial idealism had gained for them. We come then upon the following passage in Langland, in the description of the people on the Malvern Hills on that famous May Morning:

I found there some friars of all the four orders,
 Who preached to the people for personal profit;
 As seemed to them good, put a gloss on the gospel,
 And explained it at pleasure; they coveted copes.
 Many of these masters may wear what they will;
 Their money and merchandise meet well together;
 Since charity was chapman, and chief to shrive lords,
 What sights we have seen in a few short years!
 Unless they and the Church keep closer together,
 The most mischief e'er made will be mounting up fast.⁶

Small wonder, then, that it can with accuracy be said that, though the sedentary monk was only despised by the reforming spirits of the fourteenth century, the friar was vigorously hated.

This hatred is evidenced in the ridiculous rôles which he is sometimes made to play in the literature. In the opinion of social critics of the age, his obedience was exercised only toward his order and not enough toward general social and ecclesiastical authorities; his poverty was a sham; his attitude

⁵ It is with a friar that Meed carries on her negotiations in Langland's *Piers Plowman* when she wants to be freed from her sins. (B. III. 35-76). See also *Piers Plowman* (B. V. 141-2): "folk would far rather show shrifts unto them, than be shriven by priests."

⁶ (B. Pro. 58-67), quoted for convenience of the reader from Prof. Skeat's modern version in *The King's Classics*.

toward chastity was often suspected of being something less correct than mere failure to condemn vice. Boccaccio in numerous tales, Chaucer in *The Sumnour's Tale*, Heywood later in *John Tyb, his wife, and Sir John*, Lyndsay in *A Satire of the Three Estates*, an unknown ballad writer in *The Friar in the Well*,⁷ Wiclif in direct polemics—all assailed the friar or treated him in what may be mildly called an undignified way, or more accurately, in scathing denunciation. Thomas Walsingham of St. Albans said his say very plainly indeed: "Hic est frater, ergo mendax."⁸ And, finally, the exaggerated social satire of Chaucer may represent the extreme of the picture:

A frere ther was, a wantown and a merye,
 A limitour, a ful solempne man,
 In alle the ordres foure is noon that can
 So mucche of daliaunce and fair langage.
 He hadde maad ful many a mariage
 Of yonge women, at his owne cost.
 Un-to his ordre he was a noble post.
 Ful wel biloved and famulier was he
 With frankeleyns over-al in his contree,
 And eek with worthy wommen of the toun:
 For he had power of confessioun,
 As seyde him-self, more than a curat,
 For of his ordre he was licentiat.
 Ful setely herde he confessioun,
 And plesaunt was his absolucioun;
 He was an esy man to yeve penaunce
 Ther as he wiste to han a good pitaunce;
 For unto a povre ordre for to yive
 Is signe that a man is wel y-shrive.
 For if he yaf, he dorste make avaunt,
 He wiste that a man was repentaunt.
 For many a man so hard is of his herte,
 He may nat wepe al-thogh him sore smerte.
 Therefore, in stede of weping and preyeres,
 Men moot yeve silver to the povre freres.
 His tipet was ay farsed ful of knyves
 And pinnes, for to yeven faire wyves.
 And certainly he hadde a mery note;

⁷ Wherein a friar emerges "dripping wet like a new washed sheep."

⁸ Cf. *Historia Anglicana*, 1867-9, vol. ii, p. 13.

Wel coude he singe and pleyen on a rote.
 Of yeddinges he bar utterly the ptrys.
 His nekke whyt was as the flour-de-lys;
 Therto he strong was as a champioun.
 He knew the tavernes wel in every toun,
 And everich hostiler and tappestere
 Bet than a lazar or a beggestere;
 For un-to swich a worthy man as he
 Acorded nat, as by his facultee,
 To have with seke lazars aqueyntaunce.
 It is nat honest, it may nat avaunce
 For to delen with no swich poraille,
 But al with riche and sellers of vitaille.
 And over-al, ther as profit sholde aryse,
 Curteys he was, and lowly of servyse.
 Ther has no man no-wher so vertuous.
 He was the beste beggere in his hous;
 And yaf a certeyn ferme for the graunt;
 Noon of his bretheren cam ther in his haunt;
 For thogh a widwe hadde noght a sho,
 So plesaunt was his '*In principio*,'
 Yet wolde he have a ferthing, er he wente.
 His purchas was wel bettre than his rente.
 And rage he coude, as it were right a whelpe.
 In love-dayes ther coude he muchel helpe.
 For there he was nat a cloisterer,
 With a thredbar cope, as is a povre scoler,
 But he was lyk a maister or a pope.
 Of double worsted was his semi-cope,
 That rounded as a belle out of the presse.
 Somwhat he lipped, for his wantownesse,
 To make his English swete up-on his tonge;
 And in his harping, whan that he had songe,
 His eyen twinkle in his heed aright,
 As doon the sterres in the frosty night.

On account of these practices of leaving the place of settled abode, the life of the ecclesiastics is difficult to divide into real types. The simple, the lowly, and the good were to be found among friars, parish priests, and monks, as well the ambitious and the vain. Then, too, it was so often the practice to speak of any of these types as belonging to the general class of priests that we are never quite sure in reading medieval liter-

ature just what sort of a man is being discussed. Some of the friars acted as priests; some of the monks were priests and some were laymen; and some of the pardoners acted as though they were priests. But, when we come to speak of the monk as distinctly such, we can say with a certain degree of justice that most of them did live secluded and apart from the world. "The monasteries were, indeed, in no close contact, either of subordination, hostility, or alliance, with the rest of the religious world. The days of their popularity and greatness had gone by. The princes of the earth no longer rode up to the abbey door to beg an interview with some brother, renowned through Europe for his wisdom or his virtue."⁹ The King of England no longer sent for some saintly abbot, to implore him to take pity on the land and exchange the government of his house for the government of a great diocese. The cloister of Canterbury no longer rivalled the University of Paris in scholarship and in philosophy. The monks no longer, as in the days of the Barons' War, played a patriotic and formidable part in the politics of the country. The life of the monastery was cut off from the life of the nation."¹⁰ His daily life was largely regulated by the number of services which he was bound to attend.¹¹ It is easy to reconstruct the severity of their discipline out of the book of Langland,¹² the diet of salt fish and the feeblest of ale, the restrictions of their lives, and even the limitations on their numbers.¹³ It is often supposed that their days and nights were hard, when as a matter of fact they were merely regularized routine on a more serviceable basis than the workaday routine which every member of society has to follow if he accomplishes his own proportion of the work of the world. But the wind blew through the cold spaces of their monasteries no more shrilly than through the openings in many a medieval castle; their beds were little less hard than the beds of fine knights and ladies; and the lack of ordinary modern conveniences was as prominent

⁹ Cf. the praise of monasteries by Louis IX of France, and his meeting with Brother Giles, companion of St. Francis of Assisi.

¹⁰ G. M. Trevelyan, *England in the Age of Wiclif*, pp. 156-157.

¹¹ H. D. Traill, *Social England*, vol. i, p. 386.

¹² *Piers Plowman*, (B. V. 169-179).

¹³ *Piers Plowman*, "a certayn numbre", (C. xxiii. 264); and *Myroure of Our Lady*, ed. Blount, pref. p. xvi.

in the greatest manor house as in the simplest monastery. Well might G. P. R. James have said of them:

I envy them, the monks of old;
Their books they read, and their beads they told.

It was then as in the monasteries of to-day. Some of the brothers worked on the land, others cultivated the library,¹⁴ others—as Chaucer has illustrated in his picture of the “prioress” and in that of the “frere”—spent their spare time with music. The religious exercises, the choir singing, and the labor in the fields were merely ways in which the members of the community occupied their minds. There were estates on which the rent had to be collected; there was learning to be acquired and to be handed on; there was opportunity even for social agitation and reform as well as social service¹⁵ to be wrought among the poor peasants on the neighboring manors. John Ball was a priest. The monks themselves belonged to as various social strata as the priests whom we have already discussed, and it is no exaggeration to say that they had many common interests of an external—or should we say, superficial?—nature. “Some lived in Abbeys like Glastonbury, which had a gross income of £3,500; others in priories like Byrkley with a gross income of £5. . . . Even the ordinary monks of large monasteries lived in great comfort, prayed in a church both grand and beautiful, dined in a large refectory, worked in the comfortable galleries of the inner cloister, walked within the huge walls of their own carefully tended gardens amidst such beauties as may still be seen in the oldest colleges of Oxford and Cambridge.”¹⁶

But if “the solitary monk who shook the world” is a single exception in one direction, there were other exceptions in other directions, and Shakspeare came near the truth when he said that all hoods make not monks. For, as we scan the easily available body of medieval English literature, we find the monk

¹⁴ There was a great library in the monastery of St. Victor at Paris, and there were many circulating libraries at other places. Cf. *Le treizième Siècle Littéraire et Scientifique*, Lille, 1857.

¹⁵ The care of the neighboring poor often resulted in the maintenance of almshouses and hospitals.

¹⁶ A. Savin, *The English Monasteries, on the Eve of the Dissolution*, p. 266. See also, Gasquet, *The Last Abbot of Glastonbury*.

mostly depicted, not as a quiet sedentary soul living out his peace and quiet in a monastery, but as an active member of social affairs. The conspicuous—conspicuous because he was an exception—was the one represented by the realists of the time, principally because they were social satirists as well as realists. Chaucer has again, as in so many other cases, given us the complete picture of the man, this time a worldly monk.

A Monk ther was, a fair for the maistrye,
 An out-rydere, that lovede venerye;
 A manly man, to been an abbot able.
 Ful many a deyntee hors hadde he in stable:
 And, whan he rood, men mighte his brydel here
 Ginglen in a whistling wind as clere,
 And eek as loude as dooth the chapel-belle
 Ther as this lord was keper of the celle.
 The reule of seint Maure or of seint Beneit,
 By-cause that it was old and som-del streit,
 This ilke monk leet olde thinges pace,
 And held after the newe world the space.
 He yaf nat of that text a pulled hen,
 That seith, that hunters been nat holy men;
 Ne that a monk, whan he is cloisterlees,
 Is lykned til a fish that is waterlees;
 That is to seyn, a monk out of his cloistre.¹⁷
 But thilke text held he nat worth an oistre;
 And I seyde, his opinioun was good.
 What sholde he studie, and make himselven wood,
 Upon a book in cloistre alwey to poure,
 Or swinken with his handes, and laboure,
 As Austin bit? How shal the world be served?
 Lat Austin have his swink to him reserved.
 Therefore he was a pricasour aright;
 Grehoundes he hadde, as swifte as fowel in flight;
 Of priking and of hunting for the hare
 Was al his lust, for no cost wolde he spare.
 I seigh his sleeves purfiled at the hond
 With grys, and that the fyneste of a lond;
 And, for to festne his hood under his chin,
 He hadde of gold y-wroght a curious pin:
 A love-knotte in the gretter ende ther was.

¹⁷ Langland likewise has said that a monk on the road is like a fish out of water, *Piers Plowman*, (C. vi. 147-172; B. x. 292-320).

His heed was balled, that shoon as any glas,
And eek his face, as he had been anoint.
He was a lord ful fat and in good point;
His eyen stepe, and rollinge in his heed,
That stemed as a forneys of a leed;
His botes souple, his hors in greet estat.
Now certainly he was a fair prelat;
He was nat pale as a for-pyned goost.
A fat swan loved he best of any roost.
His palfrey was as broun as is a berye.

And again we shall take the Chaucerian passage as a sort of text and accumulate around it certain historical corroborations. We find that Chaucer speaks of the worldly tappings of the monks on the road, "out of his cloistre"; and this is corroborated in the case of elaborate retinues which used to follow Thomas à Becket, and so many other churchmen that it were vain to enumerate them. He says that the monk was addicted to hunting, and we find that Walter Bishop of Rochester was a great hunter, and the Abbot of Leicester was fond of hare-hunting.¹⁸ We find in general a condemnation for the tendency toward worldly amusement rather than spiritual exaltation, a tendency due to the need for amusement in a large land-owning community and to the way in which the heads of the monasteries mingled with laymen. Saint German says that the occasion "has partly arisen by temporal men who desired much the familiarity of priests in their games and sports, and who were wont to make much more of those who were companionable than of those that were not so, and have called them good fellows and good companions. And many also would have chaplains which they would not only suffer, but also command, to go hunting, hawking, and such other vain disports."

It is quite natural that to avoid being a prig the monk might very naturally be led into the pleasures of laymen, even as today we see Protestant ministers of the gospel giving up their old prejudices about theatres and even dances. Amusements that were suitable to their age and condition were deemed suitable to them. In fact, so vigorous were the denunciations of some of these practices that we are informed through the de-

¹⁸ See Skeat's note to *Piers Plowman*, (C. vi. 157.) in vol. 2, p. 68.

nunciation of their existence. There was dancing in the great hall of the priory of Norwich; there were, in another place, "the sad folly of the juniors who play cards or backgammon and the gross vanity of the precentor who would wear red dancing shoes and a riding coat." We shall continue in this vein in an attempt to understand how it happened that, in the case of Chaucer's monk, "that lovede venerye,"

Of priking and of hunting for the hare
Was al his lust.

It happened because it was being done. And we know it was being done because it was condemned, not only by the reformers who might have exaggerated, but by the ecclesiastical officials themselves who in one statement at least have quite revealed the true state of affairs by saying that these things must stop "for the future". Here then is an adequate description in negative terms, from an old pronouncement:

The brethren were for the future forbidden under pains provided for in the canons, to play at chess, dice, &c., or to use bows or slings, or run with poles, or throw stones, big or little, or to be present at fights or duels, or baiting, or cock-fighting, or to run the woods, with shout and hounds, in the profane sport of the chase.¹⁹

We have other references that they wore elaborate long gowns,²⁰ that if the abbots were not "purple as their wines," as Pope has remarked,²¹ they at least had plenty of delicate food.²² No one lived in anything that could be called comparative comfort, but the monks were rather well off for their time. The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries did not have the electric lights and the steam heat of the twentieth; and the religious suffered from domestic hardships as much as other people. But the accumulation of riches inevitably worked toward a quest for comfort and not enough toward a quest for spirituality. Said Wiclif:

¹⁹ E. L. Taunton, *The English Black Monks of St. Benedict*, vol. i, p. 309. See also Power, *Vox Clamantis*, bk. iv, cap. 2.

²⁰ Sir Thomas More, *Confutation of Tyndale's Answer*.

²¹ *Dunciad*, iv. 301.

²² Cf. *A Treatise concerning the division between the spiritualtie and the temperaltie*, by Christopher Saint German.

Freris bylden mony grete chirches and costily
waste houses, and cloystris as but were castels,
and that with-out nede. . . . Grete housis
make not men holy, and onely by holynesse is
God wel served.²³

It chanches that in 1303 there was a remarkable robbery perpetrated in Westminster Abbey which is in itself quite inconsequential, but which had brought to light many facts concerning the life in the chapter houses where the discipline was none too strict.²⁴ The disastrous fire which had destroyed the monastic buildings and compelled the monks to camp out in an almost informal way, and the fact that the abbot was an old man with a slight hold on the monks and the other chief officers incompetent—these things contributed to a relaxation of discipline, below the ordinary levels of medieval slackness. From both obentiaries and common monks John Shenche and William of the Palace, underlings of the king, secured companions for unseemly revels in the great houses which the residence of the king at York left temporarily vacant. And if we wanted to go on deeper into the records of the fourteenth century it would not be difficult to find more scandalous details to substantiate the picture of the monk which Chaucer has drawn. Or if we wanted to quibble, we might say that lay boarders were taken into religious houses, often, no doubt, with a view to their becoming permanent inmates, but not always, and that it is probably to them and to the few potential apostates that the abuses are due.

But the best thing to do is to face the facts. The canon law tells us many things that monks and friars and priests may not do. It furthermore tells us these things in such a way that we are led to believe that they actually were done before the regulation went forth which put a stop to them. Literature fills out the picture and shows us some of the men who would have fallen under the ecclesiastical condemnation. Nor is such a method of synthesizing a situation unfair. It occurs to every person who reads even the simplest rubric of the

²³ Wiclif's *Select Works*, ed. Thos. Arnold, 1869, vol. iii, p. 380.

²⁴ "A Mediaeval Burglary," by T. F. Tout, in *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, October, 1915.

church ritual that these things are the result of experience, that rule, and precept, and doctrine, and law were checks upon actions before they became warnings against actions. Dogma is thus, as Mr. Chesterton has said, the end of thought, and not the absence of thought. Practice showed the necessity for such rules, and the problem as to what should be done to avoid future similar difficulties in similar difficult situations stood as the direct cause of the rule, precept, doctrine, or law. This is one of the most consoling things about the morality and the discipline — both for layman and for ecclesiastic — of the Catholic Church, that this is the thing that accumulated experience has proven to be best. We would not have it taken away. And if we are to admit the very good reason as a virtue of our own times, we ought at least be fair enough to admit it as an indication of the evils of other times less good than our own.

We have spoken so much of evils and abuses in these two papers that perhaps some slight explanation is required before we close. The literature of the Middle Ages depicts ecclesiastical life on both the good and the bad sides, but depicts each side in a different manner. The good side is done rather dramatically and by implication. The good breathes through the greater part of the vast body of that literature. But when we come to exclusively realistic writing, we find that people took the good for granted. We find that the realists who described the undesirable things were men who were attacking with polemic, satire, or pleading the abuses which they depicted. This is the attitude of Langland, Chaucer, and Wiclif. They tell of these things; but they make no attempt to say that the things of which they tell are characteristic: they denounce them as abuses. There was in those days a certain very well defined anti-clericalism, which had nothing to do with the Protestant Revolt of later years. It was anti-clericalism pure and simple, and was directed, as its name signifies, against excessive clericalism and not against the clerics. It resented the confusion of temporal and worldly affairs in social and economic and political matters. It preached that the shoemaker should stick to his last and the peasant tend his own garden plot and the lord take care of his peasants and the priests guard their flocks. It urged a greater sincerity. "Men will call

Langland," says Mr. Chesterton, "the 'morning star of the Reformation' or some such rubbish; when the Reformation was merely the victory of one class of his foes, the greedy merchants, over another class of his foes, the lazy abbots." In other words, anti-clericalism as it existed then, and as it exists to-day, is not in any sense a Protestant movement, but rather a Catholic mood. We see it in the Middle Ages, particularly in the last years of the fourteenth century, reflected in the realistic literature whose aim was social satire. And since satire is never any too kindly toward the object of its criticism, it is to be expected that the priests and prelates, the friars and monks who walk down the pages of Chaucer, who are paraded through Langland, who are flayed by the invectives of Wiclif—that these ecclesiastics are presented in that literature in what is, mildly speaking, a rather uncomplimentary manner.

There were other priests in those days; there were other monks and other friars; they wrote the penitential lyrics and the devotional songs and the religious dramas. They did not get into the realistic literature because they were not subjects for social satire.

ELBRIDGE COLBY.

Minneapolis, Minnesota.

FREEMASONRY AND MODERN LIFE.

THE ideals and activities of international Freemasonry have been described in two preceding articles.¹ The present paper is an attempt to interpret these ideals and activities: to find, if possible, what is the "essence" of Freemasonry, to discover in what relation it stands to the modern world of thought and action, and to offer an explanation of its vitality and cosmopolitan character.

MASONIC PHILOSOPHY.

The spokesmen of Freemasonry take pains to emphasize that one of their fraternity's prime aims, if not the prime aim, is the quest of truth. In other words, they insist that Masonry is first of all a system of thought, a philosophy of life. In so

¹ ECCLES. REVIEW, June, 1917, lvi, 590-616; July, 1917, lvii, 43-65.

far then as this philosophy is taken seriously by Masons, with what philosophy has it the closest affinity?

Masonry has not given birth to any new or original philosophy. In the domain of thought, it has been a mirror, a reflector, not a creator. And in the main it has reflected rationalism. The term is here used in its broadest sense to designate "not any class of definite doctrines or criticisms, but rather a certain cast of thought, or bias of reasoning, which has during the last three centuries gained a marked ascendancy in Europe . . . [This bias] leads men on all occasions to subordinate dogmatic theology to the dictates of reason and of conscience, and, as a necessary consequence, greatly to restrict its influence upon life. It predisposes men, in history, to attribute all kinds of phenomena to natural rather than miraculous causes; in theology, to esteem succeeding systems the expressions of the wants and aspirations of that religious sentiment which is planted in all men; and, in ethics, to regard as duties only those which conscience reveals to be such."²

Rationalism, understood in this broad sense, dominates the German and Latin Masonic bodies. They show a pronounced antagonism to anything savoring of "dogma" and to all ecclesiastical teaching authority, and their leaders explicitly and repeatedly declare that the individual reason, and the individual reason alone, is the final and supreme arbiter in the field of religious belief. Typical quotations such as the following could easily be multiplied, were it necessary, and did space permit. "One thing is certain: fundamentally, Masonic thought, as all the great Masonic philosophers, poets, and thinkers have rightly recognized, is, in the religious field, closely bound up with rationalism. Consequently it is necessary for us to take sides absolutely against orthodoxy."³ "In Freemasonry, reason is called upon to supply not only the form but the content of religion."⁴ "We do not attack Christianity, but rather hold ourselves bound to restore it in its purity,

² W. E. H. Lecky, *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*, ed. of 1910, London, etc., i, pp. xviii-xix.

³ Otto Caspari, *Die Bedeutung des Freimaurertums*, 2d enl. ed., Berlin, 1910, 102. As a Mason and as a former professor of philosophy at Heidelberg, he is well qualified to speak.

⁴ *Latomia*, quoted by Joh. Sassenbach, *Die Freimaurerei, ihre Geschichte, Tätigkeit u. innere Einrichtung*, 8th ed., Berlin, 1909, 57.

and in a form appropriate to the times, as natural and absolute religion, stripped of Judæo-pagan influences and of mythological deviations."⁵ Freemasonry is the "permanent framework of free thought".⁶ It "is simply a society of free men, who reject, for others as well as for themselves, every hindrance to the autonomous development of reason and conscience."⁷ It "believes that by reason alone man may succeed in his quest of truth."⁸

As for Anglo-Saxon Masonry, we must first of all make allowance for the very large proportion of the brethren who as mere "lodge-members" rather than real "Masons", do not give a moment's thought to Masonic philosophy, and who would probably be amused at being supposed to adhere to rationalism or any other ism. Then, too, many Anglo-Saxon Masons—a very great many in fact—who do take their fraternity seriously, would vehemently and quite justly protest against being listed in the rationalists' directory. They are conservative Protestants in affiliation and belief; they are not rationalists and have no sympathy with rationalism.

Nevertheless the spirit of rationalism largely pervades contemporary Anglo-Saxon Masonry, the American branch in particular, although it is not as prevalent as among the German and Latin bodies, and in the main takes a somewhat different form. A small minority, chiefly within the Scottish Rite, assume, like most of the Continental Masons, an attitude of direct hostility to all non-Masonic "dogmas", and even go far toward denaturing the fundamental theistic dogmas of Masonry itself.⁹ But the far more common attitude to dogmas is that of indifferentism, tolerant in spirit but rationalistic in origin. The existence of God and immortality are the only eternal verities, the only postulates of reason and conscience, the sole essentials for salvation here and hereafter. Other dogmas are truths of the period, and have no adequate rational basis, or at least are unessential. If however your neighbor believes them,

⁵ J. G. Findel, in *L'Acacia*, Paris, 1903, i, 230.

⁶ Hiram (pseud.), *ibid.*, 180.

⁷ Goblet d'Alviella, in *Bulletin des Travaux du Suprême Conseil de Belgique*, no. 27, Bruxelles, 1885, 299.

⁸ G. D. Belletti, "L'opera di Giovanni Landrieux e la massoneria," in *Il Risorgimento italiano*, Torino, Aug., 1911, anno IV, fasc. 4, p. 474.

⁹ ECCLES. REVIEW, June, 1917, 599-603; July, 1917, 52-4.

do not meddle with his belief. It will not hurt him. It may help him. Live and let live.¹⁰

The characteristic and widely prevalent, although not universal, philosophy of Anglo-Saxon Masonry may therefore be called a species of indifferentistic rationalism.

Further light is thrown on the underlying philosophy of Masonry by the history of Masonic thought.

Modern rationalism is as old as modern civilization. But until the dawning eighteenth century, modern rationalism had been confined in the main to exclusive circles and select coteries. At this period however in England it first made considerable headway in much wider circles, particularly among the educated and aristocratic classes. It is an interesting coincidence, at least, that modern speculative Masonry had its origin at the same time and in the same place and mainly among the same classes. And moreover there are very good reasons for considering that we are here confronted with something that is more than a coincidence.

The Act of Toleration of 1689 went far to clear the way of obstacles to the wider diffusion of free thought. The rationalism of the day took two forms, that of pure rationalism or deism and that of Christian rationalism. Men were growing tired of religious persecution and the conflict of creeds, and were seeking peace and a bond of union on a platform on which all could stand. Broadly speaking, the deists sought it in that creed in which all *men* agreed,¹¹ the Christian rationalists in that creed in which all *Christians* agreed. These were the respective essentials of religious belief. The rest was non-essential opinion, which the deist tended openly to attack, and which the Christian rationalist tended quietly to ignore. The deist sought unity and concord by eliminating tradition and revelation and holding to reason alone, the Christian rationalist by interpreting tradition and revelation in the light of reason.

That Masonry was the direct offspring of deism proper is not proven. Historians, Masonic and non-Masonic, are not agreed. Findel, Nys, and the writer of the article on deism in the *Allgemeines Handbuch der Freimaurerei* hold that it

¹⁰ ECCLES. REVIEW, July, 1917, lvii, 52-4.

¹¹ John Toland, *Clidophorus*, in *Tetradymus*, London, 1720, 94-5.

was influenced considerably by deism;¹² so too do the non-Masonic historians, Hettner and Lange.¹³ Mackey and Gould take the opposite view; as do also more recently Boos and Wolfstieg, who base their conclusions on the evidence assembled by Begemann.¹⁴

Begemann's evidence, as summarized in his *Vorgeschichte*, is to the effect that often in the writings of the early decades of Freemasonry deists were expressly excluded, and that the very Constitutions of the society were using then common names for the deist when they said that if a Mason "rightly understands the art, he will never be a stupid atheist, nor an irreligious libertine". Moreover, the leaders of early Masonry, Anderson, Desaguliers and Sayer, were not, it seems, of the deistic party.

This evidence, however, while having some weight, does not appear to be quite convincing. Feeling against infidelity still ran high among the English people, and deists had to work somewhat under cover. Moreover, they were a sorry and shabby crowd as compared with the masterly geniuses who opposed them. Consequently "the ordinary feeling for the deist was a combination of the *odium theologicum* with the contempt of the finished scholar for the mere dabbler in letters."¹⁵ The leaders and spokesmen therefore of early Masonry would very naturally have been loth to see their infant society branded with the deistic stigma, and so the professed exclusion of deists—a hypothetical one at that, in the Constitutions—cannot safely be taken at full face value. Besides, we know that one at least of the deists' writings, Toland's *Pantheisticon*, exercised no inconsiderable direct influence on the early

¹² J. G. Findel, *History of Freemasonry*, 2d ed., tr., London, 1869, 125-6; E. Nys, *Origini, glorie e fini della Massoneria*, tr., Roma, 1914, 25-6; *Allg. Handbuch d. F.*, 2d ed., 3 vols, Leipzig, 1863-7, i, 218-20. Cf. also J. F. Newton, *The Builders*, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, 1915, 178, note.

¹³ H. Hettner, *Literaturgeschichte d. achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 5th ed., Braunschweig, 1894, i, 199-200, 202, 206-7, 214; Lange, *Hist. of Materialism*, 3 vols., tr., 4th ed., London, 1892, i, 325; cf. also George Schuster, *Die geheimen Gesellschaften*, Leipzig, 1906, ii, 1-12.

¹⁴ A. G. Mackey, *Encyclopedia of Freemasonry*, ed. of 1916, Philadelphia, 237; R. F. Gould, *History of Freemasonry*, New York, etc., 1884 ca., iii, 152; A. Wolfstieg, in *Preuss. Jahrbücher*, Berlin, vol. 145, p. 538; H. Boos, *Geschichte d. Freimaurerei*, 2d ed., Aarau, 1906, 138; W. Begemann, *Vorgeschichte u. Anfänge d. Freimaurerei in England*, 2 vols., Berlin, 1909-10, ii, 28-31.

¹⁵ Leslie Stephen, *Hist. of English Thought in the Eighteenth Century*, 2 vols., 3rd. ed., N. Y.—London, 1902, i, 87-9.

Masonic fraternity.¹⁶ It seems significant, too, that, as Keller points out, the semi-official Masonic *Apology* of 1738, decidedly deistic in tone and largely derived from the *Pantheisticon*, was openly published just after the admission of the Prince of Wales into the Masonic fold—an acquisition which practically guaranteed safety and royal protection as well as prestige to the order.¹⁷

Let us now turn to the carefully drafted Masonic Constitutions. "You shall be true to God and the holy Church, And you use noe heresie nor error," ran the old operative Masons' charges. Then in the speculative Masons' Constitutions comes the sharp contrast: "We leave every Brother to Liberty of Conscience." "A Mason is obliged by his Tenure to observe the Moral Law, as a true Noachida." This is a categorical *moral* obligation. The *doctrinal* obligation is put hypothetically immediately after: "and if he rightly understands the Craft, he will never be a stupid Atheist, nor an irreligious Libertine, nor act against Conscience. In antient Times the Christian Masons were charg'd to comply with the Christian Usuages of each country where they travell'd or work'd." Now note the contrast again: "But Masonry being found in all Nations, even of divers Religions, they are now generally charged to adhere to that Religion in which all men agree"—this last concept is deistic, while the classing of positive beliefs as mere "opinions" in the following clause is characteristic of both deistic and Christian rationalism—" (leaving each Brother to his own particular Opinion) that is, to be good Men and true, Men of Honour and Honesty, by whatever Names, Religions, or Perswasions, they may be distinguish'd ". Here again we find the emphasis on moral conduct, religious belief being put in the second place.

"For they all agree in the three great Articles of Noah, enough to preserve the Cement of the Lodge." The religion of Noah antedates the *positive revealed* religion of Moses. "Thus Masonry is the Centre of their Union, and the happy Means of consiliating Persons that otherwise must have remain'd at a perpetual Distance." This was the aim of deistic

¹⁶ ECCLES. REVIEW, June, 1917, lvi, 600-1.

¹⁷ L. Keller, *Die Freimaurerei*, Leipzig-Berlin, 1914, 5-6.

and Christian rationalism—union, peace, and concord among various creeds. “No Quarrels about . . . Religions . . . must be brought within the Doors of the Lodge: For, as Masons, we are of the oldest Catholick Religion above hinted”¹⁸—again the common creed of all *men* or at least of all *Christians*.

The aversion to physical force in religious matters and the insistence on toleration and liberty of conscience, the emphasis on morality rather than on dogma or creed, the distinction between religion and non-essential dogmatic opinion, the reaction against the strife of creeds, and the desire of religious union by eliminating or compromising or ignoring differences of belief and by seeking a common theological platform—this circle of ideas is distinctly characteristic of English deistic and Christian rationalism of the early eighteenth century. Further, the Constitutions, in stressing the natural, unrevealed religion of Noah, the religion in which all *men* agree rather than that in which all *Christians* agree, in so far borrow from and lean to deistic rationalism, or at least leave the door open to the deist. And through that open door the deist actually entered, as we have seen.¹⁹

Then, too, the moral code of early Masonry is much more suggestive of the classical Greek and Roman ethical ideal than of the Sermon on the Mount.²⁰ Besides, there soon appeared an emphatic leaning to the standards of the ancients, a harking back to and frequent quoting from the classic philosophers, and a growing interest in the non-Christian philosophies and religions from Pythagoreanism to the Kabbala, with here and there little flings at “those mean and gloomy Souls, who think that the greatest Piety consists in making Scruples of all kinds, in having the holy Lear and hypocritical Cant of a strait-laced Christian, who not having Discernment enough to see any Thing as it should be, would represent Almighty God,

¹⁸ *New Book of Constitutions of the most ancient and honourable Fraternity of F. and A. M.*, Dublin, 1751, 36, 137, 141; *Constit. of 1738*, London, 143-4, 147; *Constit. of 1723*, repr. N. Y., 1855, 50, 54.

¹⁹ *Supra*; cf. also R. F. Gould, *Concise History of Freemasonry*, New York and London, 1904, 417.

²⁰ *Constit. of 1723*, 51-6; *Apology of 1738*, quoted in Keller, *Freimaurerei*, 7 ff.; “Apology for the F. and A. M.”, in Scott’s *Pocket Companion*, 2d ed., London, 1759, 296-9.

like themselves, for ever with the Brand of Destruction in his Hand. The Masons detest this infernal Spirit.”²¹

Weighing all the above facts, we are justified, it seems, in drawing the following conclusion: Early English Masonry, while not exactly the direct offspring of deism, was largely inspired by contemporary rationalism. Some of its ideas were derived from deistic rationalism, although its sympathies were on the whole inclined more to Christian rationalism. It did not exclude the deist from its ranks, but aimed rather at gathering into one fold, deist, Christian rationalist, and conservative Christian.

The later development of English and Anglo-Saxon Masonry is easily followed. Toward the middle of the eighteenth century, English deism declined or appeared to decline, and it remained dormant or masked until the close of the century, when it broke out again. Meanwhile, although “the common sense of the country was entirely on the side of Revelation as against Deism”, “theology was for the most part almost as deistical as the deists.”²² Masonry clearly reflects these conditions. The Masonic literature from before the middle of the century on became distinctly Christian in tone, and was honey-combed with references to the “essential” articles of the Christian faith, while marking time on the “unessential” ones.²³

In 1813 the distinctly Christian teaching was expunged from the English Ritual,²⁴ but such teaching remained intertwined²⁵ with Masonic neutrality well into the latter part of the century, and to no small extent still is.²⁶ The present drift of Anglo-Saxon Masonic teaching is distinctly away from positive Christianity to Unitarianism or Christian theism, and probably the present century will witness a further decided set toward idealistic monism.²⁷

²¹ “Apol. F. and A. M.”, in Scott, *l. c.*, 298 and in G. Oliver’s *Golden Remains*, iii, 115-6.

²² Stephen, *l. c.*, ii, 368-70.

²³ Oliver, *l. c.*, i-v, *passim*; cf., for instance, i, 91, 199; iii, 163-4; iv, 273-5.

²⁴ Cf. Newton, *l. c.*, 221.

²⁵ The rise of Romanticism probably had something to do with this. Cf. R. Pound, *Lectures on the Philosophy of Freemasonry*, Anamosa, Iowa, 1915, 47-55 *passim*.

²⁶ ECCLES. REVIEW, July, 1917, lvii, 50-1.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, July, 1917, lvii, 52-4; June, 1917, lvi, 601-3.

To sum up. With the qualifications noted in the preceding pages, we may say that the characteristic underlying philosophy of Anglo-Saxon Masonry has been and is a tolerant, rationalistic indifferentism, an indifferentism however that is not absolute but that is limited within the confines of theism.

In eighteenth-century England the rational Christian could meet the deist halfway. Not so in France. No compromise between rationalism and Catholicism was possible. Again, in England genius was for the most part on the side of Revelation. In France it was on the side of infidelity.²⁸ So French rationalism of the eighteenth century reacted sharply against Christianity and became distinctly skeptical and even largely atheistic.

French Masonry, in the main aligned with the prevailing French rationalism, went through the same phases of development. The rise of the Scottish Rite in France about the middle of the century brought into the order the spirit of aggressive antagonism to Christian beliefs, and before long Masonry came largely under the influence of the Encyclopedists.

Still later the philosophy of Comte spread far and wide through French and most of the rest of Latin Masonry, and the same positivist philosophy continues to pervade the ranks of the contemporary Latin bodies.

Germanic Masonry, while reacting against orthodoxy, has remained on good terms with the rationalist element in German Christianity. It has been very deeply influenced above all by two schools of thought, both rationalistic—the theological rationalism within the modern Lutheran Church, and the philosophical rationalism of the German idealists. At the present day, no authorities are so looked up to by German Masonry, nor so frequently quoted and commented on, as are Herder, Goethe, Lessing, and Fichte.

Let us endeavor to summarize the past and present relations of universal Masonry to modern rationalism. In Catholic countries, where the line of demarcation between the ecclesiastical and the rationalistic viewpoints was sharply defined, Masonry has been and is militantly rationalistic and anti-ecclesiastical. In Protestant countries, where this line of demarca-

²⁸ Stephen, *l. c.*, i, 89.

tion has not been and is not so sharply defined, where a certain fusion has taken place between traditional Christianity and rationalism, Masonry too has fused and still fuses with the Churches to a large extent, in the main however manifesting the closer affinity with the rationalistic elements in Protestantism, although it was in turn for a time influenced by orthodox Protestant beliefs. Or, to view the field from another angle, Masonry has largely reflected and still largely reflects the prevailing local rationalism. In Anglo-Saxon countries, it has been, like the prevailing rationalism, mainly theistic, indifferentistic, tolerant. In Germany, it has, like the prevailing rationalism, stressed morality and religious feeling at the expense of creed, and has tended strongly toward idealistic monism. In Latin lands, it has, like the prevailing rationalism, tended distinctly to agnosticism and positivism, and even to materialism and atheism.

In view therefore of the parentage, the life history, the present status, and the recent drift of Masonry, we seem to be justified in looking upon the fraternity as being, fundamentally, *an organized embodiment of the spirit of rationalism.*

Of course, as I have tried to emphasize, many Masons give no thought to Masonic philosophy; many also are eminently conservative in their Christian beliefs; for a long period too the underlying rationalism was, in Anglo-Saxon Masonry at least, much obscured by incrustations of traditional Christian dogmas. In venturing however upon the above generalization, I have had in mind, not individual Masons or groups of Masons, not particular times or places, but the broad dominant tendency of the international two-hundred-year-old organization as such.

Comte endeavored to erect rationalism into a religion with a religious cult. He failed. Haeckel and his school are attempting the same task. Whether or not they will succeed, remains to be seen. But Masonry has largely succeeded along this line. It has its elaborate symbolism and ritual, its creed and ethical code, its temples and altars and priesthoods. Whether or not we call it a religion is largely a matter of words. Masons themselves are not at one on the point, but they all agree that their fraternity, if not *a religion*, is at least *religion*, or has a *religious basis*. Bearing in mind the society's underlying philosophy, may we not call Masonry,

if not a religion of rationalism, at least *religion built upon a rationalistic basis?*

"The Papal See," wrote Hettner, "with the keen insight particularly characteristic of it in ecclesiastical and political matters, perceived in the clearest manner the inmost essence of Freemasonry. The Papacy banned it as early as 1738, and expressly on the ground that the order was based not on ecclesiastical but on purely human foundations; '*affectata quadam contenti honestatis naturalis specie*,' as the Papal Bull put it."²⁹ Not otherwise spoke Leo XIII in 1884 when he referred to Masonry as "naturalism". The oaths, the secrets, the ritual, and such things, are minor matters; the essential part of Masonry from the Catholic standpoint is its philosophy.

"Protestantism is from the religious viewpoint only half of what Freemasonry is in entirety,"³⁰ as a Mason has succinctly expressed it. Catholicism rests on a synthesis of the three authorities of the Living Voice, the Written Word, and reason. Protestantism rejected the Living Voice and fell back on the Written Word and reason. Rationalism further rejected the Written Word and fell back on reason alone. Naturally, the cleft between Catholicism and a society founded on rationalism is still wider than the cleft between Catholicism and Protestantism.

THE MASONIC IDEAL.

Rationalism is only one phase, the intellectual or religious phase, of a far larger movement, the movement making toward greater individual autonomy in all human activities. Because one man is a biped, fifty men do not make a centipede, remarks the genial Mr. Chesterton. Nevertheless there is a certain analogy between the life history of the individual human being and the life history of nations and races. Nations and races, like individuals, as they grow in culture, education, and wealth, develop a heightened sense of personality, a deeper self-consciousness, become more and more restive under outward restraint, and feel more acutely the fascination and witchery of freedom and self-reliant autonomy. At any rate, many if not most of the momentous changes that have marked the last half

²⁹ Hettner, *l. c.*, i, 216; cf. Sassenbach, *l. c.*, 24, 53-6.

³⁰ *Latomia*, quoted by Sassenbach, *l. c.*, 57.

millenium or more of Western civilization have centred round the struggle for freedom.

In the domain of ideals as in the domain of thought, Masonry has never been distinctly original or creative. Its function has been that of a mirror, or, to be more exact, of a lens. It has gathered together and focussed a good proportion of the scattered forces engaged in the quest of individual autonomy. And on the wings of this magic word of liberty, Masonry has soared into its place in the sun. Its main goal has been *the loosening within certain varying limits of the prevalent restrictions on individual liberty*; or, to express it affirmatively and more briefly, its practical ideal has been the attainment of *individual autonomy*.

The grounds for this generalization are found not only in the patent activities and explicit utterances of Masonry, but also in the society's reactions to non-Masonic movements and organizations. Before reviewing these grounds, we may premise that liberty may mean many things. Latin Masonry in particular frequently uses this shibboleth to cover some queer forms of what the average American citizen would call license or oppression.

Liberty, freedom, independence, autonomy—no words are of such frequent occurrence in Masonic literature as these. They turn up everywhere. And not only are they the most often met with, but the general idea they convey is the most fundamental in the Masonic purview. It is the master key that unlocks nearly all the doors in the labyrinthine but consistently designed Masonic temple.

1. Religious ideal. This has been treated at length in the foregoing section on Masonic thought. The autonomy and self-sufficiency of the individual reason are stressed. Dogmas binding in conscience tend to be rejected, while ecclesiastical teaching or governing authority is as a rule distinctly and often indignantly repudiated.

2. Ethical ideal. Anglo-Saxon Masonry in the main holds the moral law to be a command of divine authority, but there is a tendency to ignore or expressly reject the idea of divine sanction, particularly the sanction of divine punishment. Obedience to the moral law should be the voluntary response of love to love. A divine threat brings moral coercion to bear

upon the individual. The growing monistic trend in Anglo-Saxon Masonry puts still farther into the background the pressure of divine moral coercion and leaves the individual still more self-reliance and autonomy in his moral pursuits. The Scottish Rite lays stress on moral conduct as the means of freeing ourselves from the slavery of the passions.

German Masonry rejects materialism, because the mechanical interpretation of life robs man of his freedom and free will and makes a puppet of him. It likewise largely rejects what it considers the traditional Christian conception of a divine world-ruler, because this conception tends to make a slave of man.³¹ The pantheistic and quasi-pantheistic tendencies, so common in the German fraternity, leave free rein to the course of independent and self-reliant virtue, and incidentally give rise to a certain ethical exhilaration that is perhaps the chief emotional attraction of the pantheistic philosophy of life.

Latin Masonry, in so largely accepting materialistic monism, has had in so far to sacrifice the idea of free-will, but on the other hand, in the pursuit of its ethical ideal, it is freed from the constraint of divine authority.

3. Domestic ideal. On the subject of domestic freedom, as instanced in divorce, Anglo-Saxon and German Masonry as such have no particular creed. Pike and many other Masons *personally* agree to a great extent with the Catholic Church on the divorce question.³² In the lands, however, where legislation permitting divorce did not or does not already obtain, Latin Masonry has in recent decades consistently pressed for the enactment of such legislation—at times even on the mere ground of mutual consent—which would give greater freedom to the married.³³

4. Political ideal. The fairly consistent advocacy of political freedom by most of Masonry has been treated somewhat at length in a preceding article.³⁴

³¹ ECCLES. REVIEW, June, 1917, lvi, 605-6, 612-3; cf. also Z., in *Die Grenzboten*, Berlin, 1910, 69. Jahrg., 2. Vrtljr., 301.

³² "Reply to Leo XIII", in M. R. Grant, *True Principles of Freemasonry*, Meridian, Miss., 1916, 297-8.

³³ ECCLES. REVIEW, June, 1917, lvi, 614; July, 1917, lvii, 63, 64; cf. also A. J. Naquet, *Le divorce*, 2d ed., Paris, 1881; *La loi du divorce*, *ibid.*, 1903; *Bauhütte*, Frankfurt a. M., 1899, xlii, 125 and 1901, xlv, 195; M. Le François, *Le plan maçonnique*, Lille, 1905, 54-5.

³⁴ ECCLES. REVIEW, July, 1917, lvii, 44-9.

but also highly benefited; that the passing vibrations of sound that reach my ears from the pulpit can make an impression on my soul that will last forever. Indeed, if we were ideal Christians, free from every alloy of human frailty, we should never be tempted, let alone misled, to discriminate between the sermons we hear from our heavenly-appointed shepherds, the priests and bishops of the Church, because of our belief that they are all of them the spokesmen of Christ, speaking in His name and with His authority.

But even in religious matters human nature will insist upon asserting itself where, when, and how it can. Hence our preference for one preacher to another, notwithstanding that both preach the same gospel and announce the same truths. It may easily be that the one we like less is even from the viewpoint of mere art the better speaker of the two. Yet we do not take to him so well for some reason we ourselves are often at a loss to discover, so intricate and mystifying are the caprices of the human heart. We must be strongly on our guard, however, not to let this capriciousness of the heart or of the feelings run wild, as he would do, for instance, who, because he does not fancy a preacher's manner, entirely neglects the sermon, either by absenting himself from it or, what is equivalent, by giving a free field to distractions during it.

I have reason to congratulate myself on having for my pastor a man who is gifted in speech as well as exemplary in conduct. Although I have listened to his sermons for a number of years, Sunday after Sunday, not counting many other special occasions, I do not remember that I ever grew wearied or bored in the listening. He has never said "Amen" without leaving me with a desire to hear more. My philosophical bent of mind has naturally led me to investigate the secret of his oratorical power over me as well as over practically all the parishioners who think.

Simplicity I hold to be the chief characteristic of his eloquence. Our pastor is by no means a showy, dramatic, demonstrative, or flowery speaker. His style as well as his delivery is plain, simple, and pleasingly natural, without even as much as a distant hint of labor or affectation. His fluent tongue seems merely to serve as the conductor of the convictions of a mind that is aglow with thought and of a heart that is afire

with enthusiasm and zeal. The outward apparel of his eloquence, the mechanism of words, the formation of sentences, the pitch and color of voice, the method of gesture—all dwindle away in the warmth of communication. If I were asked to-day what sort of gestures our pastor makes during his speaking, I would honestly have to own that I don't know. I have the impression that he gesticulates in some way when he waxes warm in his discourse, but he seizes me so with his thought and feeling that he never allows me time for merely artistic observations in the course of his sermon. When it is over, far from reflecting on the technical merits of his composition or elocution, I am busy upbraiding myself for the faults he castigated and arranging means of pursuing the virtues he inculcated. He is the best example I know of those preachers who, as has been said, induce the hearers not to be satisfied with the preacher but to be dissatisfied with themselves.

One reason of our pastor's lasting popularity is his prudent valuation of the capacity of his hearers and a consideration for their human weaknesses. He is not guilty of overtaxing their willingness to listen to him. He never speaks to an unreasonable length. He always ceases before his audience is sated. He believes more in impressive condensation than in diluted and ineffective amplification. You can observe, when he is about to close, that he has much more to say and is very eager to say it, but he prefers to restrain himself and spare his hearers, thus preventing them from being surfeited with one, and making them eager for another sermon. I have often heard people complain that he finished too soon, but never, that he spoke too long.

Another feature which attaches the audience to our pastor is the variety of his preaching. No matter how often he addresses us, he always appears with a new message, as it were, revealing something he has never told us before just in the same manner. His talks—for his sermons really have the air and tone of a confidential talk to every individual listener, as though he were the only hearer—invariably have the ring of novelty, of a new and important communication. Although there is no appearance of labor, I judge his discourses must be prepared quite carefully, for no human mind could be so ready in its resourcefulness without a large amount of reading, thinking, and writing.

Moreover, our pastor is a man of his day. He speaks for present needs and applies the gospel to actual conditions. To hear him speak you would judge him to have a wide and keen experience in worldly matters. When he discourses on labor you feel as though he himself once worked in a factory, in an office, on the railroad, in a department store, or a common grocery. When he descants on worldly pleasures, it strikes you that his knowledge is detailed, objective, and immediate. When he expatiates on temptation, sin, and remorse, you are aware that his information is gathered from a source more living than books. Not that you would for an instant suspect his character; but you give him credit for knowing the human heart to its very depth and for observing human life. And who has more occasion to observe it in its various phases and rôles than the priest, the divine confidant of thousands of souls? He reminds you of the reply the great preacher Massillon gave to one who asked him where he got so minute and true a knowledge of the foibles, passions, and temptations of the human heart. "From my own heart," he answered.

In another sense, likewise, is our pastor a man of his day. He loves and admires the period in which we are living. He has said that, outside the time in which our Lord was visible on earth, there is no epoch in the history of mankind in which he would rather have lived than in the present one. You will never hear him bewailing the evil days we are passing through, or moaning that the darkest days have been reserved for us, not even in these strenuous days of the great war. He leans always to the side of optimism. It is a pleasure to hear him recount the advantages of the present age over its predecessors, and tell the reasons why we should thank God for letting us pass our life in this chapter of human history. He never touches upon the war but in manner that is consoling, soothing, encouraging, and inspiring. The war has given him occasion for his best sermons on the sweetness of Divine Providence, on the power of heroism latent in human nature, on the grandeur of Christian charity, unselfishness, and forgiveness.

I am forced to admit, however, that after all it is the personality of our pastor more than anything else which gives his public speech both its charm and its power. His personal holiness, which is too apparent to be doubted, whatever efforts

he may make to hide it, and his large and warm sympathy, from which no one is excluded, avail him more in the pulpit than the clear ring of his voice, his dignified presence, and his unhalting fluency of speech. You are glad to listen to the man, because you like him so much. You spontaneously fall in with his views, because you feel his sincerity and conviction. You readily yield to his pleadings, because you realize that his sole aim is your best interests. In a word, you surrender yourself as a willing captive to an esteemed and beloved leader.

If the description seems exaggerated to some cold and phlegmatic natures, I beg them to remember that the coldness and seeming indifference of an audience are often the cause of lack of warmth and spirit in the preacher. Discourse, to be human and warm with life, requires responsiveness. Where this is lacking, the best preacher will fail. Attention, docility, and appreciation on the part of the hearers stimulate the speaker powerfully and quicken all his dormant powers of eloquence. If anything vexes me in church, it is the bad manners and the poor Christianity of those who by loud coughing or sneezing or restlessness, or by a sleeping and yawning attitude, do what they can to dampen the fire of the best speaker and to paralyze the effect of an otherwise powerful sermon. If our Catholics, as a rule, would devote as much well-timed criticism to their own behavior during the sermon as they employ ill-timed and uncalled-for criticism on the sermon and the preacher, we would have better preaching and better Catholics in all our parishes, not even excepting our own.

F.

THE SHORT FORM OF EXTREME UNCTION.

Qu. In the June number of the REVIEW (page 620) we read: "The S. Congregation of the Holy Office decides that, when Extreme Unction has been administered in a case of necessity by the anointing of the forehead only, and the short form of words, the other senses are not to be anointed later on, even conditionally".

In the May number of the *Razon y Fé* Father Ferreres makes the following observations on the same decree:

1. The decree of the Holy Office refers to another of 31 January 1917, that we have not seen cited in any other place. According to that decree, in case the sick person does not die immediately

after having received Extreme Unction with that general form and its corresponding single unction, but there is time, then all the unctions prescribed for other cases have to be supplied. This confirms what we have already taught in *Razon y Fé* (vol. XVI, p. 236), and in Gury-Ferreres, *Comp.* vol. II, n. 683; *Casus*, vol. II, n. 791; and Vermeersch teaches the same (*De Religiosis*, Suppl. vol. III, p. 58). Ferreres, l. c. Coppin, Stimart (*Sacr. Liturg. Comp.*, n. 688, edit. IV); Tanqueray-Quievastre, n. 1260. Of the contrary opinion were *Il Monitore* (vol. XIX, p. 239), Lehmkühl (*Comp.* 938), Noldin (*De Sacr.* n. 452).

2. The unctions are supplied in this case, not for the validity of the sacrament, since there can be no doubt of validity with the short form and one unction on the forehead, but "ad plenioram sacramenti significationem".

3. From which it must be inferred that the unctions are to be supplied, not conditionally but absolutely. For if these unctions were supplied because one doubted the validity of Extreme Unction administered under the short form and one unction, they would have to be supplied *sub conditione*, as is always done when there is doubt of the validity of a sacrament, and it is repeated for safety sake. But since it is not for this reason, but to express "plenioram sacramenti significationem", these unctions must be supplied in *forma absoluta*, as the decree we are explaining directs.

4. From the above it appears that the decree of 31 January, 1907, and that of 9 March, 1917, confirm in all respects what is found in *Razon y Fé* (October, 1906, l. c., p. 238, n. 15): "If after employing the short form the sick man is still alive, it seems that all the senses are to be anointed with the form proper to each, as the Ritual prescribes, and the prayers are to be added. These orations are not necessarily to be said *sub conditione*, as if to supply the validity of the anointing of the short form, but "ad plenioram sacramenti significationem," to better signify the effects of Extreme Unction. Similar is the case in sacerdotal ordination, when the bishop, having finished Mass, says to the young priests: "*Accipite Spiritum sanctum, quorum remisistis peccata remittuntur eis*," etc., he does not confer on them the power to absolve, for they already received that when he made them priests, which was before the Mass just finished by consecrating with the bishop. The words merely explain the power already received by virtue of the sacrament.

Dr. Ferreres concludes, and reads out of the decree that, after anointing a man: "Per istam sanctam Unctionem indulgeat tibi Dominus quidquid deliquisti, Amen," if he continue to live, all the unctions have to be repeated absolutely, with no condition.

Would you kindly settle this question for us?

CONSTANT READER.

Resp. Father Ferreres's interpretation of the decree is, we have no doubt, the correct one. The decree referred to by the Notary of the S. Congregation had not been placed in the authentic collection. We assumed that the date was a clerical error, and that the reference was to a similar decree of the previous year (25 April, 1906) which reads: "In casu verae necessitatis sufficere formam, 'Per istam sanctam unctionem'" etc. But the existence of the unpublished decree, as Fr. Ferreres reasons, explains the matter. We may then legitimately infer that the omitted unctions are to be supplied, whenever the person anointed with the short form survives. That is also the obvious reading of the decision as reprinted in our *Analecta* when rightly punctuated.

THE POPE AND THE ECUMENICAL COUNCIL.

Students of theology the world over will be glad to know that the illustrious author, Father Augustine Lehmkuhl, S.J., is, at his great age of eighty-three years, still active, and interested in the work of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, to which he was one of the earliest contributors. In a letter of 2 June of this year he writes from Valkenburg, Holland:

I have just received the May number of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and read therein the interesting paper on "The Pope and the Ecumenical Council." I am too old to write a controversial article on this subject; but the question regarding the Council of Constance is one that is open to discussion by some expert historian and canonist.

Let me here give merely a few thoughts that may suggest a line of argument. I am convinced that at the time of the Council of Constance the legitimate Pope was alone Gregory XII. The question of obedience to him was no doubt involved and limited. The Roman lists of pontiffs invariably include his name as a successor of St. Peter—though that fact in itself would not be wholly decisive as demonstrating his title to the Pontifical throne. It is, however, beyond doubt that Gregory XII was elected as the successor of Urban VI, and that the validity of the election was questioned only *subsequently*, by a number of disaffected cardinals. They were unable to bring any convincing arguments against the validity of his election.

It would seem to have been a providential arrangement that not only Gregory XII but also John XXIII should have participated in convoking the Council of Constance. While John XXIII absented himself by flight, a plenipotentiary of Gregory XII, as the acts of the Council relate, appeared as his representative in the assembly. The Fathers received him and listened silently to his written address in which he solemnly announced the *Consociatio Concilii* in the name of Gregory XII. At the conclusion of the act, Count Malatesta announced immediately that, having convoked the Council, it was Gregory's wish to end all animosity by tendering his abdication of the Pontifical authority. The Council of Constance was thus empowered by legitimate authority to proceed to the election of a new Pope.

THE NUPTIAL BLESSING OUTSIDE THE NUPTIAL MASS.

Qu. Is it permitted to give the Nuptial Blessing outside the regular Nuptial Mass? As this has been a subject of discussion in a recent gathering, will you kindly give authorities?

Resp. The Nuptial Blessing, consisting of the prayers "Propitiare, etc.", "Deus qui potestate, etc.", and "Deus Abraham, etc.", contained in the Missal, is to be distinguished from the other blessings contained in the Roman Ritual. The former belongs to the "solemnities" of the marriage ceremony, and is not to be given outside the Mass. The authorities, such as Sabetti, *Compend. Theol. Moralis*, n. 864, Q. 2, Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Moralis*, II, n. 910, rely on several decrees of the S. Congregation of Rites, the most recent of which is n. 3789, dated 9 May, 1893. Lehmkuhl, however, calls attention to the fact that local customs to the contrary have been allowed, and special faculties or indulgences granted.

CATHOLIC PHYSICIAN IN CONSULTATION.

Qu. A Catholic obstetrician is called in consultation with a non-Catholic physician in regard to a severe complication of pregnancy before the viability of the foetus. Medical treatment has been of no avail, and, according to most authorities, the indication is to terminate pregnancy. Is the Catholic physician justified in discussing the remedy of emptying the uterus, provided he explains the

Catholic doctrine and makes it clear that he must withdraw from the case if abortion is going to be produced? I am familiar with the general teaching in the matter; what I want to know is whether the physician, a specialist, may let the party know that, while he will not be party to abortion, he is familiar with the practice and can indicate the consequences.

Resp. As our correspondent is familiar with the general teaching on the subject, including the decree of the Holy Office dated 24 July, 1895, he must be in a position to judge whether the operation of "emptying the uterus" in the particular case that he proposes would be illicit or not. He must know, too, that, in case the operation is illicit, a Catholic physician is forbidden not only to perform it or assist in performing it, but also to advise it. The only point to be debated is whether the physician may "discuss" the remedy, without advising or urging that it be performed. It seems to us that he may. Certainly, if, after he has explained that he considers the operation to be morally wrong, the other physician declares that he, a non-Catholic, does not share that view but is determined to operate, the Catholic physician may discuss how, according to the latest devices of medical practice, the operation may be most successfully performed.

STATUES ON THE MAIN ALTAR.

Qu. The patron of our mission church is St. Peter Claver. We are about to build a new main altar and would like to place the statue of the Sacred Heart of Jesus above, in the middle, St. Peter Claver's statue on the Gospel side, and the statue of St. Anthony on the Epistle side. Is this contrary to any of the demands of the Church?

Resp. The general rule is that no statue should be placed on the tabernacle—we suppose that the main altar is the altar on which the Blessed Sacrament is kept—nor in such a way as to be in front of the crucifix which should stand between the altar lights. "*Ab aspectu crucis sacerdoti celebranti passio Christi in memoriam revocatur, cujus passionis viva imago et realis representatio hoc sacrificium est*" (Bona, *Rer. Liturg.*, I, 25, n. 8.). There is a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites, n. 2752, which decides that the statue on the main

altar should be that of the titular of the church. The Gospel side of the altar is, of course, the place of dignity compared with the Epistle side.

THE SANCTUARY LAMP.

Qu. I am told that Rome has granted permission to use kerosene oil for the sanctuary lamp, instead of olive oil, on account of war prices and the difficulty of getting olive oil. Some even say we have been recently granted permission to use gas for the sanctuary light. I can find no authority for these statements. Is there any?

Resp. In the REVIEW for December 1916, page 689, the decree of the S. Congregation of Rites dated 23 February, 1916, was explained. The decree recites that several bishops have called attention to the difficulty of obtaining olive oil in some places, and orders that, "in view of the peculiar conditions, and while they last," other oils, vegetable oils, as far as possible, or beeswax, pure or mixed, or electric light, may be used in the sanctuary lamp. The matter is referred to the prudent judgment of the ordinary. It would seem that, while it may be difficult and expensive to secure imported olive oil of undoubted purity, native olive oil may still be obtained at a reasonable price in most parts of the United States. The test for purity of product need not, of course, be so rigorous in this case as in the case of olive oil required for sacramental purposes.

DANCING AT CHURCH PIONIOS.

Qu. We are going to have a parish picnic. Would it be allowed to have dancing, provided there was no charge made for those who dance?

Resp. The matter of finances does not enter into the merits of the question at all. The decree of 31 March, 1916, renewing the provisions of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, goes a step farther than the Canon of the Council. The Canon (n. 290) reads: "Mandamus quoque ut sacerdotes illum abusum quo convivium parantur cum choreis (*balls*) ad opera pia promovenda, omnino tollendum curent". The decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation decides: "Sacerdotes

quoslibet, sive saeculares sive regulares prorsus prohiberi quominus memoratas choreas promoveant et foveant etiamsi in piorum operum levamen et subsidium vel ad alium quemlibet pium finem". It is further provided that, when the dancing is organized or arranged (*promovere*) by lay people, clerics may not be present.

PASSIVE MEMBERSHIP IN ODD FELLOWS.

Qu. A Catholic belongs to the Odd Fellows, but does not attend their meetings, although he pays dues. He does this for the material gain there is in it, although he has no insurance. May he go to the Sacraments?

Resp. This seems to be a case of passive membership in an order condemned by the Church. The Apostolic Delegate to the United States has faculties to deal with cases of this kind, and so also, by favor of the Holy See, have the Archbishops of the United States, according to a letter of Cardinal Rampolla to His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, dated 27 June, 1913. We advise that the case be referred in the first instance to the bishop of the diocese.

COLOR OF ANTEPENDIUM AT REQUIEM MASS.

Qu. If an antependium is used on the altar during Requiem Mass, of what color should it be, black or purple? Is black used only on Good Friday?

Resp. The general rubrics of the Missal provide that the antependium should, as far as possible, correspond in color to the vestments used. "*Pallio quoque ornetur (altare) coloris, quoad fieri potest, diei festo vel officio convenientis*" (Tit. XX). Thus on Good Friday, and at Requiem Masses, the color should be black. When, however, the solemn Requiem Mass is celebrated at an altar in the tabernacle of which the Blessed Sacrament is kept, a violet or purple antependium should be used. The Dubium, "*Potestne adhiberi pallium nigri coloris in solemnī cōmmemoratione et exequiis defunctorum ad altare Sanctissimi Sacramenti?*" was answered *Negative* by the S. Congregation of Rites (decree n. 3201, ad X). When Mass is celebrated at an altar on which the

Blessed Sacrament is exposed, the antependium should be white, no matter what the color of the Office may be. For example, decree n. 2673 forbids the use of a red antependium on an altar on which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed on Pentecost Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday.

THE PASCHAL CANDLE.

Qu. What is the rule in regard to the Paschal Candle? Should it be lighted at low Mass and at Benediction?

Resp. The rule is that the Paschal candle should be lighted at the solemn services of Mass and Vespers on all Sundays and holidays until Ascension Thursday. It should be lighted at the parochial Mass, even when it is a low Mass, and it is customary to light it on Monday, Tuesday, and Saturday of Easter week. It is not customary to light it at Benediction. Following is the text of a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites, dated 19 May, 1607: "Cereus paschalis regulariter accenditur ad Missas et Vesperas solemnes in tribus diebus Paschae, Sabbato in Albis, et in diebus Dominicis usque ad Festum Ascensionis D. N. J. C." (Decree n. 235, ad XI^{um}.)

CATAFALQUE "ABSENTE CADAVERE."

Qu. Is it allowed to have a catafalque over which the absolution is said, on the third, seventh, and thirtieth days, and at anniversary Masses? Please quote your authorities.

Resp. Although the "absolution" after requiem Masses is not of strict obligation except "praesente cadavere", it is allowed, and, indeed, we may say, encouraged by the ritualistic prescriptions regarding the ceremonies to be performed on the third, seventh, and thirtieth days, and at anniversary Masses. Our authority is the Roman Ritual, which, after describing the Office to be held, "absente cadavere", including the "absolution", adds the following rubric: "Praedictus autem officii ritus pro defunctis adultis, tam Sacerdotibus et clericis quam saecularibus et laicis, servari debet in Officio sepulturae in die depositionis, sive in die tertio, septimo, trigésimo et anniversario."

BURIAL OF PROTESTANT IN CATHOLIC CEMETERY.

Qu. May a Protestant be buried in a Catholic cemetery, and may a priest say some prayers at such an interment, provided the prayers have nothing distinctly Catholic about them?

Resp. If the Catholic cemetery is not consecrated, there is no law of the Church to prevent a Protestant from being buried in it. Deeds to burial lots are often drawn up in such a way that, if the owners of the lot insist, they have the legal right to bury a Protestant in the lot which they own. It would, however, be, to say the least, unbecoming for a priest to recite any prayers at the grave of a Protestant, in a Catholic cemetery. The principle involved was asserted in a somewhat similar case when the Holy Office decided (19 January, 1886) that, in a place where there are no Protestant ministers, a priest may not "accompany the remains of a Protestant (*haeretici*) from the house to the cemetery, although the body had not been brought to the Church nor the church bells rung."

VERSICLE AND PRAYER AFTER LITANY B. V. M.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In the March number of the REVIEW, page 299, you answered the inquiry of a correspondent concerning the versicle and prayer to be recited or sung after the Litany of the Blessed Virgin at Benediction, and expressed the opinion that it seems more correct to use the same versicle and prayer throughout the whole of the liturgical year. Allow me to suggest that you have overlooked the fact that the new edition of the Roman Ritual published in 1913 indicates a change of both versicle and prayer for the different liturgical seasons. This change, it would seem, should be made whenever the Litany is recited or sung, at Benediction as well as at other times, since the Rubric is general and no indication of a different practice for Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament is given. I am inclined to think that the S. Congregation of Rites has forbidden the use of "*Dominus vobiscum*" and "*Domine exaudi etc.*", be-

cause these versicles no more form part of the Litany of the B. V. M. than do the additions "Christe audi nos", "Christe exaudi nos", so commonly found in English prayer books.

SACERDOS WELLINGTONENSIS, N. Z.

FIRST FRIDAY EXERCISES.

Qu. In the May number of the REVIEW the attention of an inquirer is called to the decree which gives the privilege of a votive Mass of the Sacred Heart on the first Friday of the month to churches where "peculiarior exercitia" are held "mane" in honor of the Sacred Heart. Would not this condition be met by the recitation of the Litany of the Sacred Heart at one of the Masses on the First Friday?

Resp. The decree grants a favor, and is therefore "of liberal interpretation". Hence it would appear that, since the recitation of the Litany of the Sacred Heart would literally fulfill the condition, it is sufficient, and the privilege in such a case may be said to exist.

THE THREE-BRANCHED CANDLE USED ON HOLY SATURDAY.

Qu. Is it allowed to place the three-branched candle used on Holy Saturday beside the paschal candle "in cornu Evangelii", and keep it there until Ascension Thursday?

Resp. From a query directed to the S. Congregation of Rites it appears that this custom existed in some localities. The answer of the S. Congregation directs that, after the ceremonies on Holy Saturday, the three-branched candle, otherwise called "arundo" or "Lumen Christi," be removed from the church.

Criticisms and Notes.

EXTREME UNCTION, HOLY ORDERS AND MATRIMONY. A Dogmatic Treatise by the Right Rev. Monsignor Joseph Pohle, D.D. Authorized English translation by Arthur Preuss. (The Sacraments, Vol. IV). B. Herder, St. Louis and London. 1917. Pp. 249.

ESCHATOLOGY, or the Catholic Doctrine of the Last Things. A Dogmatic Treatise by the Right Rev. Monsignor Joseph Pohle, D.D. Authorized version with some abridgment and additional references by Arthur Preuss. B. Herder, St. Louis and London. 1917. Pp. 164.

With these two volumes Mr. Preuss's translation of Professor Pohle's Dogmatic Theology reaches its conclusion and the English language becomes enriched by a work of unique character and value. We have, it is true, several other more or less similar treatments of the same general subject; notably Father Hunter's well known *Outlines* and Drs. Wilhelm and Scannell's excellent adaptation of Scheeben. But heretofore there has been in English no such comprehensive and thoroughly systematized course of Theology as we now possess in the present twelve handy and well made textbooks—textbooks, since in style, method, and general arrangement they are perfectly adapted for use in the class-room, though they serve no less conveniently the purpose of priests who desire to review their Dogma and prefer using an English rather than a Latin instrument in so doing. But to the didactic aspect of the series we hope to return on a future occasion. Suffice it here and now simply to call attention to these two concluding sections.

Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony are treated, it is unnecessary to say, with the breadth, solidity, and lucidity which we have noted repeatedly as characterizing the work throughout; and with no less a sense of the practical bearing which the Sacraments of Holy Orders and Matrimony have upon the life of the Church and the race.

Eschatology treats of the consummation of the individual and of the universe, mankind included. The four last things for the individual are death, judgment, heaven, hell; for mankind they are the last day, the resurrection, the final judgment, and the end of the world. Obviously these momentous themes bristle with problems the discussion of which demands great doctrinal precision and discernment as well as a comprehensive mastery of all the sources of faith and of the province of reason in the pertinent fields. These

qualities are realized fully in the little volume above. Since it is impossible for the finite mind to realize the tremendous truths here discussed, the writer or the preacher is not infrequently tempted to piece out his mental incapacity by the products of imagination; the result of which appeal to fancy is often to beget doubt or suspicion on the reality of the awful truths themselves. Needless to say, there is none of these flights of phantasy in the pages of this sober theology. The student feels that he is here in the presence of the sternest of realities—facts and truths which he knows he himself shall have to confront—and that he needs no saner and no more realistic presentation of them to his intelligence than is given him in this exposition of Eschatology. The student finds here solid food for his own mind and heart, and the preacher who ponders over the doctrine expounded in these pages can afford to disregard the temptation to paint the consummation of things with the lurid colors of fancy.

THE FAIREST ARGUMENT. For our non-Catholic Friends. By the Rev. John F. Noll, LL.D. Third edition. Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Indiana. 1917. Pp. 399.

Father Noll knows the sort of books the world just now needs. What is more, he knows how to produce them. That wide-awake little weekly, *Our Sunday Visitor*, is a proof in point. For Catholics and for non-Catholics it is an ever-flowing source of the truth they stand in need of at present and it comes to them in a form and shape which they can grasp and assimilate. Another proof of the author's sense of actuality is the *Fairest Argument*. The book was first published several years ago, but has been for some time out of print. It now reappears, greatly revised and improved. For this reason and because of its unique value for the clergy it is again noticed in the present pages.

No line of argument could be fairer to non-Catholics than that which they themselves have devised. It is this which is offered to them here. The better informed Protestants are finding out that the history, teaching, and practices of the Church have been grossly misrepresented by her enemies. The fair-minded, moreover, are becoming more just and candid in the expression of their admiration for the Church, especially as they grow in the realization that whatever is best in their own religious faith and practice has been an inheritance from the Mother Church who was forsaken by their forefathers. As a consequence many of the best arguments for the traditional beliefs are furnished by non-Catholics. But what is more, the distinctively Catholic doctrines, such as Purgatory, Confession, the Eucharist, the Virgin Mother, as well as our discipline on the

Bible, Marriage, Education, have likewise found in non-Catholics valiant defenders. Besides all this, some of the strongest arguments against Protestantism have been formulated by non-Catholics.

How forceful this whole line of argument really is can only be appreciated when its manifold points and aspects are brought together and systematized as they are in the present volume. From numerous books, periodicals, lectures, sermons emanating from non-Catholic sources, Father Noll has gathered and classified the most telling and effective statements and arguments in support of the Catholic faith. His book becomes therefore an arsenal of the latest weapons defensive of Catholicism and destructive of Protestantism—all of them forged by non-Catholic hands. It would thus seem to justify its title *The Fairest Argument*. The argument, let us add, could be made still *fairer*, and obviously *stronger*, were the author in a future revision, which will doubtless be demanded, to cite more definitely and with greater exactness the sources of the numerous quotations. The book leaves something to be desired in this connection.

THE "CHRONIOA FRATRIS JORDANI A GIANO". By the Rev. Edwin J. Anweiler, O.F.M. A Dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Letters of the Catholic University of America in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Washington, D. C. 1917. Pp. 63.

It is a decided encouragement to students inclined toward constructive and research work in theological and philosophical history to note the various dissertations that have recently been presented to the Faculty of our Catholic University for academic degrees.

The *Chronica* of Friar Jordan is a unique bit of thirteenth-century literature. It deals chiefly with the foundations of St. Francis in Germany at a time when the Saint himself still ruled the Order. Jordano was an Umbrian who entered the community some years before the death of the Saint, and who approved himself at once as a leader. Accordingly, after being ordained to the priesthood, he was deputed to act as guardian of the Thuringian foundations and for more than thirty years acted as director and visitor of the German communities.

In his old age he was prevailed upon to tell the story of the pioneer days when it had been incumbent upon him to introduce the Rule of St. Francis, approved by Honorius III, into the northern houses, and to maintain a reform that was doubly important during the beginnings of the mendicant era. What the gentle Friar dictated was taken down in writing by the clever Friar Baldwin of Brandenburg, after whom the work is occasionally named "*Scripta Fratris*

Balduini de Brunswick". But the original MS. appears to have been lost, and the only record of it is to be found in two copies. One of these is a manuscript dating apparently (in its main parts) from the middle of the fourteenth century, but incomplete. It is known as the Berlin MS. or Codex, being preserved in the Royal Library of Berlin. The other MS. supplements it, and is known as Codex "K", being preserved in the Landes Bibliothek of Karlsruhe. Several editions of the *Chronica* have been published under the scholarly supervision of Dr. Heinrich Boehmer, and others.

Dr. Anweiler's work consists in furnishing us with an Introduction, literary and critical, which takes account of all that has been thus far done to correct the text of the *Chronica*, to trace the various sources of the readings or variants, and to interpret their meaning. Friar Jordan himself modestly avows that his verbal account may not have been without fault and error. This renders the work of the critic additionally difficult, since he has to discriminate between the lapses of memory to which Brother Jordan confesses and the oversight of the amanuensis and subsequent copyists. One such error is the title Brunswick for Brandenburg in the name of the amanuensis himself. There are other divergences which Dr. Anweiler straightens out for us, and which testify not only to his care in comparing MSS., but also to his discriminating judgment as a critic. For the rest, the Introduction is of course mainly addressed to the special student of *Franciscalia*.

A MEMORIAL OF ANDREW J. SHIPMAN. His Life and Writings.
 Edited by Condé B. Pallen, Ph.D., LL.D. Encyclopedia Press, Inc.,
 New York. Pp. lxx—372.

Mr. Pallen deserves the gratitude of Catholics, the clergy no less than the laity, for the deeply interesting and sympathetic sketch of the life of Andrew Shipman and the *ensemble* of papers and addresses written by that typical Christian gentleman and cultured scholar. Andrew Shipman was a man of whom Catholics may justly feel proud. If one were to search the history of the Church in this country he would come across few if any laymen in whom were associated so many traits that could so deservedly be held up to his brethren for admiration and imitation as were embodied in the subject of the present *Memorial*. This may seem an excessive statement, but those who read the story of his life and the monuments of his labors will most likely recognize that it understates rather than overstates the merits of Andrew Shipman. A convert to the faith in his youth, Mr. Shipman had inherited from his old Virginian ancestry a natural habit of body and mind which formed a sound basis for faith, reli-

gion, zeal, self-sacrifice, devotedness to high ideals, and all the claims of Christian charity. A good physique, a vigorous mind, ardent love of knowledge—not hoarded for its own sake but gathered for beneficent diffusion—were the healthy preparations and perpetual associates of his deep religiousness and whole-hearted charity.

In an address delivered by him in 1911 to the graduates at Georgetown, Mr. Shipman alludes to the motto emblazoned on the shield of the University—*Utraque unum*. He traces the words to the great antiphon of Advent, *O Rex gentium . . . qui facis utraque unum*, and shows how they sound "the keynote of all true progress . . . the blending of the divine with the human; the mingling of the spiritual with the material in every effort of man to go forward" (p. 349). The passage here quoted sums up—unconsciously, of course, to himself—the fundamentals, the characteristics of the speaker. The allusion to the liturgy is just a hint of that love for the Church's official worship which urged Mr. Shipman to devote so much of his busy life to the study of liturgy and which made him eventually so eminent an authority in this branch of ecclesiastical lore. But the human blended with the divine in all Mr. Shipman's labors and undertakings. His love of the Eastern Liturgies was begotten of his love for the people who worshipped God in those mysterious rites. When first in his young manhood as an assistant manager of mines in Ohio he came in contact with the Slavic laborers he found them speaking various dialects. With characteristic energy he proceeded to learn them all. In this way he won the confidence of the men and so was enabled to assist them in their industrial difficulties, resulting often from confusion of tongues, especially when the official interpreters were selfishly taking advantage of both parties.

Shipman's interest, however, was not simply linguistic or economic. He saw in the Slavs an alien people in a strange land misunderstood and misunderstanding. Amongst them he found many Catholics. Having no clergy speaking their own tongue, they were as sheep without a shepherd. These people had to be saved, not only in a civic but likewise in a religious sense. This meant steadfast loyalty to their faith. Mr. Shipman studied the rites, languages, and customs of the immigrants not only by personal contact and association in the land of their adoption, but also by frequent visits to their fatherland so as to learn the character and traditions of these strange peoples at their source. Coming into relation with the Slavic clergy abroad, priests and prelates, he was able as an intermediary to perform invaluable services, religious as well as economic and civil, for the strangers in their new home.

Besides his labors foreign and domestic in behalf of the immigrants, Mr. Shipman found time to coöperate in many other lines of social and civic activities. No movement that sought his aid for human betterment but received his whole-hearted sympathy. The list of associations whereof he was an active member is astonishingly large and affords another proof of the experience that it is the busiest men who have the most time to give away. The essays and addresses collected in the present *Memorial* cover a wide range of subject matter, and furnish another evidence of the man's industry and power of work, while they illustrate too the breadth of culture, the refinement of taste, and the lofty idealism of Mr. Shipman's mind and soul. And so the volume by embalming the memory of a noble layman holds up to the present age a type than which none is more needed. In this connexion the final paragraph of Mr. Pallen's tribute may fittingly close this notice. "A lay apostolate is the recognized need of the hour. It is the layman who comes into constant and intimate contact with the world, and upon his shoulders falls the urgent obligation of an apostolate for the Faith before the world. Andrew Shipman realized all this even to a scrupulous delicacy of conscience and he fulfilled it ably and nobly, a Catholic layman without fear and without reproach, a son who proved to the world an illustrious example of the teaching and principle of the Catholic Church."

THE SISTERS OF CHARITY OF NAZARETH, KENTUCKY. By Anna Blanche McGill. The Encyclopedia Press, New York. 1917. Pp. xvi—436.

It is gratifying to observe the histories of our various institutes of religious women multiplying apace. Quite recently we had occasion to review two important publications of this kind—the *History of Mother Seton's Daughters* and the *Life of the Venerable Louise de Marillac*; the latter recounting the story of the foundation of the Sisters of Charity in France, and the former the establishment of the Sisters of Charity in America. We have here the pleasure of introducing the history of another institution of Catholic beneficence, the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Kentucky. When Saint Vincent de Paul directed Madame de Marillac in the organization of works of mercy in Paris during the earlier years of the sixteenth century, he had no idea that he was laying the foundation of an institution which Providence had designed should girdle the globe with the cords of Adam. And when Bishop Carroll guided Catharine Seton in the establishment of her Sisters of Charity at Emmitsburg he could not foresee how these American Daughters of Charity would in the course of a century dot the broad surface of this country with count-

less homes of beneficence and educational activities. So also when Father David, the subsequent coadjutor of "the saintly Flaget", of Bardstown, assigned to the Misses Carico and Wells the little log hut on St. Thomas's Seminary farm, to be the novitiate of their religious life, he too, could hardly have realized that he was planting the mustard seed which was to extend its branches far and wide throughout the United States. In numbers the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth do not equal the Daughters of Charity of Emmitsburg, but their thousands members, educating annually some twenty thousand pupils and caring for ten thousand patients in hospital and asylum, are doing the same deeds of charity as are wrought by their religious kindred in every other of our Catholic Sisterhoods.

The story of the establishment of this century-old institute of charity is told by Miss McGill in the volume at hand, with genuine sympathy. From its humble beginnings, she follows, by the aid of the records and traditions, its growth and spread down to its recent centenary. The history of every religious foundation is fascinating; the more so when it runs, as in the present case, synchronously with the social and civil life of the State and the Church, from the primitive circumstances of infancy up to vigorous maturity. As a mirror of the devoted lives of their predecessors and as an inspiration to carry forward their noble work, the volume should prove a help and an encouragement to the Sisterhood to-day.

POLITICS. By Heinrich von Treitschke. Translated from the German by Blanche Dugdale and Torben De Bille. With an Introduction by the Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour, M.A., F.R.S., LL.D., D.C.L., and a Foreword by A. Lawrence Lowell, President of Harvard University. Two volumes. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1916. Pp. xlv—406, 643.

No study is more fascinating than that of a people's character and consequently its ideals. At the same time no investigation is attended by so many difficulties. If to get at the springs of character in the individual is by no means an easy task, far less so is it to seize the character of an organized people, to penetrate its nature, to see how it came to be what it is, to discern the agencies which gave it birth and growth, in a word, to master its causes, physical, geographical, intellectual, moral, religious, social, political, and so on. The complexity of the forces at work seem to defy definite analysis. Perhaps here, as frequently elsewhere, intuition is the quickest and, if cautiously pursued, the surest road to the reality sought for. You *intuit* fairly well the character of an individual,

even though you be unable to explain satisfactorily the constituents or the development thereof. How you do it and to what degree feeling initiates and accompanies your insight, is another question. Anyhow, whatever be the process, your reflective judgment tells you that the emotional factor must be treated with caution. Feelings and images, reciprocally interacting, should be rigidly cross-questioned.

For instance, to take up the work before us, von Treitschke's *Politics*. From start to finish it is a eulogy of Germany, and particularly of Prussia and the Hohenzollern dynasty. Of course, if your emotions, your images and the concepts thence derived and upon which your judgments happen to be based are antagonistic to the objects of the German professor's laudation, you will find in von Treitschke's *Politics* only another support for those pre-judgments—let us not say prejudices. On the other hand, those whose feelings and persuasions coincide with the objects he eulogizes will most likely be ready to applaud the writer himself. It is not easy in this case to hold the scales of justice evenly and to give the man himself, or the writer, his due. The question does not here concern the cause for which he stands.

But who was von Treitschke? His name has been much in evidence recently, for, though he died almost two decades before the outbreak of the present war, several books have been written about him, and he is coupled with Nietzsche as twin cause of the cataclysm. Nevertheless, he may not be so well known to the readers of this REVIEW as to render some account of him superfluous.

Born in Dresden, 15 September, 1834, the son of an officer in the Saxon army, Treitschke had purposed embracing a military career. An illness contracted in childhood resulting in deafness obliged the youth to forgo his martial ambition for a life of letters. Having studied at Bonn and Leipsic, history, economics and politics, he became in 1858 a lecturer on history at the latter university. Successful and popular in this capacity, he published in 1866 an essay *Bundesstaat und Einheitstaat*, in which he attacked the German confederacy and advocated a German unity. Later on he lectured with great renown at Kiel, Heidelberg, and Berlin, and was also for some years editor of the *Preussische Jahrbücher*. After the establishment of the German Empire, he was elected to the Reichstag. At first a Liberal, then a Conservative, he bitterly attacked Catholics, Jews, and Socialists, and anyone indeed who was not truly German and Prussian. He died 28 April, 1896.

Treitschke was as facile as a writer as he was eloquent as a speaker. Besides his several historico-political as well as anti-socialist writings, he is the author of *A History of Germany in the*

Nineteenth Century.¹ "Every side of national life and thought is treated with a knowledge, a vigor, and an eloquence that have made the book a national possession. It is written throughout from a Prussian standpoint, with a pronounced antipathy to the smaller states and without comprehension of the men and movements that opposed the military and bureaucratic regime of the Hohenzollerns." This may be taken to be a perfectly objective criticism, as it is abundantly confirmed by Treitschke's lecture on *Politics*, embodied in the two volumes here under review. These lectures were delivered in the early 'nineties and were posthumously issued (1897-8). Selections from them were translated by A. L. Gowne (London, 1914). The lectures are now to be had in full in the translation before us; a translation, we might here add, which in respect to style and literary finish may be called perfect, so completely have all traces of a foreign idiom been obliterated.

Whatever be the reader's sentiments regarding the European conflict, he cannot mistake von Treitschke's. Whether one likes them or not, they are expressed with a frankness and a bluntness that seem almost brutal; so that the opinion of those who regard Treitschke as "one of the spiritual instigators of the great war" is not improbable. For him "the State is Power" (p. 62 and *passim*); hence "it can obviously draw all human actions (external) within its scope. Its primary obligation must be the care of its Army and its Jurisprudence" (p. 63). Consequently, "without war no State could be. All those we know of arose through war, and the protection of their members by armed force remains their primary and essential task. War, therefore, will endure to the end of history, so long as there is multiplicity of States. The laws of human thought and of human nature forbid any alternative, neither is one to be wished for. The blind worshiper of an eternal peace falls into the error of isolating the State, or dreams of one which is universal" (p. 65)—an *Unding*, a thing "at variance with reason". Indeed, "the grandeur of war lies in the utter annihilation of puny man in the great conception of the State, and it brings out the full magnificence of the sacrifice of fellow countrymen for one another" (p. 67). And so "the historian who moves in the world of the real Will sees at once that the demand for universal peace is purely reactionary. He sees that all movement and growth would disappear with war, and that only the exhausted, spiritless, degenerate periods of history have toyed with the idea" (p. 68). "Wars neither can nor should cease" (p. 68). Whilst it is undoubtedly true that it is

¹ English translation. 7 vols. McBride, New York, 1915, ff.

Far remote from human sight
When war and discord from the earth shall cease,

it is untrue for Treitschke that

Every prayer for universal peace
Avails the blessed time to expedite.

Rather would it be wrong to hope or pray for such a condition, since "God above us will see to it that war shall return again" (p. 69).

When Treitschke comes to consider the relation of the State to the Moral Law he recognizes a certain preponderance of the latter. On the other hand, he has no difficulty in so devitalizing the Moral Law that the State becomes ultimately supreme. The Decalogue, "with the exception of the injunctions to fear God and honor one's parents, contains only legal commands" (p. 93), but "Luther has taught us that the chief commands of Christianity are love and liberty of conscience" (*ibid.*). Hence it is that "the truly Christian ethic has no rigid standard; its teaching is 'Si duo faciunt idem, non est idem'. Whoever, by the grace of God, is an artist and knows it, has the right to develop his gift before all else, and may put other duties in the background. And so it is with the State. Since its very personality is power, its highest moral duty is to uphold that power." "As nothing in the world's history is its superior, the Christian obligation of sacrifice for a higher object is not imposed." And so, while "we praise the State which draws the sword to fend off ruin from itself, sacrifice for an alien nation is not only unmoral [immoral?] but contradictory to the idea of self-maintenance, which is the highest content of the State" (p. 94). Hardly second to Luther does Machiavelli come in for laudation. It will be "to the abiding honor of this illustrious Florentine that he set the State upon its own feet, freed it from the moral sway of the Church, and above all was the first to declare distinctly that the State is Power. But, despite it all, he had himself hardly stepped out across the threshold of the Middle Ages. When he tries to liberate the State from the Church and declares, with the boldness of modern Italian patriots, that the State of Rome has plunged his country into misery and woes, he still holds by the idea that morality is an ecclesiastical attribute, and that when the State cuts loose from the Church she also breaks away from the moral law in general. He says that the State should only strive toward the goal of its own power and that whatever appertains thereto is necessary and right. He tries to think like the Ancients, but fails, because he is a Christian and has eaten of the Tree of Knowledge" (p. 84).

In the light of the foregoing, von Treitschke's conception of the relations between Church and State will be evident. "If the State is sovereign, it can allow no other body which is subject to its supremacy [!] to treat with it regarding the limitations of its own power. It may accord far-reaching rights to a Church, but must remain the arbiter of what those rights should be. A concordat is a treaty of one power with another, but the State must not permit the Pope of Rome to meddle with its authority. It must, to borrow a phrase first employed by Bismarck, keep its hand upon the lever of legislation. Further, the Curia cannot avoid deliberate dishonesty in concluding such compacts. Both parties take up totally divergent moral standpoints. No special blame should be imputed to the good old man now imprisoned in the Vatican, but the Roman Curia must be by its very nature [!] insincere" (p. 342). And so on.

If the Church has no inherent rights save what are given to her by the supreme State, it goes without saying that when the State finds it profitable to withdraw those rights, it can justly do so. It will not excite surprise therefore to read that no one "to-day would condemn the secularization of the Church's goods in the sixteenth century which relieved the Church of worldly possessions contradictory to its real spirit and at the same time furthered the nation's economic prosperity" [!]. The State is not (theoretically) declared to be absolutely exempt from the Moral Law, but the latter, being so much more flexible than the Sovereignty and Power of the former, there probably never will occur any circumstance in which, when the two happen to conflict, the State will not usurp the mastery.

The foregoing citations may suffice to point out some of Treitschke's fundamental ideas. For the rest, it should be noted that the author of those volumes is more an historical essayist than he is either an historian or a philosopher. Mr. Balfour in the Introduction accuses him of quite a number of historical blunders. Others, from a Catholic standpoint, might easily be added to the list—one particularly regarding the condition of primary education prior to the Reformation (Vol. I, p. 364). Brother Azarias's scholarly *Essays* might furnish a corrective at this point. On the other hand, with all the false philosophy underlying von Treitschke's *Politics*, and the errors of history noticeable here and there, it is proper to add that these two stately volumes contain a large amount of sound thought and wise interpretation, a wealth of interesting fact and shrewd observation pertinent to the forms, the constitution, and the functions of the State. Moreover, whilst the volumes are shot through with false ideals, they are pervaded by a manifest earnestness of purpose and a loftiness of motive. These notes, however,

can never condone the faults of the work, here brought to the attention of our readers because it is one to be reckoned with by students of the literature of historical politics.

THE LABOR MOVEMENT. From the Standpoint of Religious Values.

By Harry F. Ward, Professor of Social Service, Boston University School of Theology, and Secretary of The Methodist Federation for Social Service. The verbatim stenographic report of a series of noon-day lectures delivered at Ford Hall, Boston, 1915, together with the questions and answers of the forum period following each lecture. Sturgis & Walton Co., New York. 1917. Pp viii—199.

We have here the printed replica of a series of lectures delivered at Ford Hall, Boston. Ford Hall, we are told, "stands for free discussion of questions carrying a distinctive ethical message. It is in a large way a church for community religion. Within its walls every religious, racial and political element in the community have come together seeking for a faith common to all " (p. v). The broad platform, therefore, of Ford Hall with its Open Forum policy was a fitting place for presenting lectures that were attended by the "conglomerate crowd of ministers, business and professional men, Socialists, Labor Unionists, and I. W. W.'s that made up the audience " (p. vi). That so miscellaneous an auditory filling the spacious hall could be held day by day and could be sufficiently interested to engage in discussion with the speaker may be regarded as a tribute both to the worth of the lectures and the power of the lecturer. And certainly as one reads the present text, the presumption is seen to be well founded.

Professor Ward has evidently mastered the chief aspects of the labor movement and he thinks and writes about it clearly and attractively. Probably, however, his sympathy with the toilers, which is thoroughly sincere and broadly human, was the dominant force which effected the spell that seemed to the introducer of the present volume to have had something bewitching or hypnotic in its soul (p. vii). The features of the Labor Movement discussed are the trade unions, Socialism, syndicalism, labor's demands for more leisure, income, labor violence, labor and the law, democracy and industry. These topics are treated chiefly in their ethical aspects. The lecturer's ideas are on the whole sane and practically suggestive. Perhaps the sympathetic tendency carries him occasionally into Utopia, but a little indulgence in genial optimism was surely more desirable than a lapse into grouchy pessimism.

In view of Professor Ward's religious affiliation one naturally expects, though one must regret it, an occasional bit of unkindness, or rather misunderstanding. For instance, when he has occasion to speak of "life organized in brotherhood", he goes on to say how this "principle has been slowly making its way in human history and has been destroying all despotisms—despotisms of state and of church. . . . It is making impossible all priestly hierarchies howsoever organized and in whatsoever terms concealed" (p. 181). Evidently Mr. Ward has forgotten that it was precisely when "the priestly hierarchy", *unconcealed by any terms*, was really most influential in the organizing of industry, when industry indeed was organized on a religious as well as an economic basis, in the medieval guilds, that the principle of industrial brotherhood was most effective; and that it was only when those brotherhoods became disrupted by Protestantism that the economic followed of necessity the religious revolution.

The undertow of Mr. Ward's feelings in regard to the Church seems to be so swift that quite unconsciously it has pulled him into what, *pace tanti viri*, we cannot but call a most flagrant absurdity. Notice the reply to the following question: "Would you advise the support of the Socialist party as it is to-day in carrying out your ideals. . . . ? *Answer*: I have seen so many things in the past about the alliance between Church and State and its results that I must insist that that is a question which belongs only to the conscience of every individual man" (!). Is it to laugh, or was the answer meant for some other question and got entangled at the wrong place?

Apart from these few unfortunate instances of ill feeling the author is exceedingly genial, so much so that even for the I. W. W.'s he has the most kindly sympathy to impart; and we are happy to note that the sympathy was fully reciprocated.

A useful feature of the book is the list of questions proposed by the auditors, and appended here to the several lectures. It may well be that the querists were not always contented with the replies; but then you know it is impossible to satisfy everybody.

THE PRINCIPLES OF NATURAL TAXATION. Showing the Origin and Process of Plans for the Payment of All Public Expenses from Economic Rent. By O. B. Fillebrown. With portraits. A. C. McOlurg & Co, Chicago. 1917. Pp. xx—281.

Occasion has arisen from time to time to recommend *The A B C of Taxation*, by the author of the volume at hand, as a small catechism in which all manner of questions pertaining to the Single Tax are

proposed and succinctly answered. In the present volume Mr. Fillebrown develops the history of the Single Tax movement as well as the arguments for what he claims to be the natural method of taxation; taking occasion in this latter half of the book to remove certain misapprehensions too frequently set up as straw-men to be tilted at by critics who have taken little pains to get at the real champions.

Whether one agree or disagree with the Single-Taxers, common justice would surely demand that one should honestly endeavor to study their theory and their arguments and not attribute to them absurdities which have no place in their system, such, for instance, as land nationalization. Students who want to know what the advocates of the Single Tax have to say for themselves will find what they desire very clearly and interestingly presented in the present compilation, the object of which, in the author's words, is to trace the metamorphosis of the land question into the rent question; of the equal rights to land into the joint right to the rent of land; of the common use of the earth into the collective enjoyment of ground rent; of the nationalization of land into the socialization of its rent; of private property in land, including the private appropriation of its rent, into the public appropriation of that rent without disturbance of the private ownership of land.

Apparently Mr. Fillebrown has no knowledge of Dr. John Ryan's critique of the Single Tax, which is contained in the latter author's *Distributive Justice* (Macmillan Co., 1916). It would be interesting to know what reply he would make to Dr. Ryan's objections. A second edition of the present work would afford the desired occasion.

Literary Chat.

Even that prince of philosophers, he of Aquino, has so completely passed out of the consideration of modern non-Catholic writers, philosophical or otherwise, that you very rarely find any allusion to him in recent literature. Why this should be is easily explained, since St. Thomas is of the Nazareth out of which no good is supposed to come forth. However, when you do meet with a non-Catholic tribute to the Angelic Doctor, read it over a second time, scrutinize its source, and take note of it.

David Hume would be the last philosopher under the skies whom you would expect or suspect of going to the works of St. Thomas in support of his own opinions on the association of ideas. Although, if you did find in an essay by the prince of modern sceptics statements identical with those of Aquinas, you would hardly look in that phlegmatic writer for any reference to the apparent source of them. We owe to Samuel Taylor Coleridge the discovery that Hume borrowed his views on association from St. Thomas. And the present writer owes to that most recondite of researchers, "W. H. K." in the *London Tablet* (16 June), the discovery of Coleridge's discovery. The passage is worth

quoting, since many of our readers may not see it in the paper from which it is here transcribed:

"In consulting the excellent commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas on the *Parva Naturalia* of Aristotle I was struck at once with its close resemblance to Hume's essay on association. The main thoughts were the same in both, the order of the thoughts was the same, and even the illustrations differed only by Hume's occasional substitution of more modern examples. I mentioned the circumstance to several of my literary acquaintances, who admitted the closeness of the resemblance, and that it seemed too great to be explained by mere coincidence; but they thought it improbable that Hume should have held the pages of the Angelic Doctor worth turning over. But some time after, Mr. Payne, of the King's Mews, showed Sir James Mackintosh some odd volumes of St. Thomas Aquinas, partly, perhaps, from having heard that Sir James (then Mr.) Mackintosh had in his lectures passed a high encomium on this canonized philosopher, but chiefly from the fact that the volumes had belonged to Mr. Hume, and had here and there marginal marks and notes of reference in his own handwriting. Among these volumes was that which contains the *Parva Naturalia*, in the old Latin version, swathed and swaddled in the commentary aforementioned."

The *Open Court* (Chicago) publishes from time to time books from which we have to express dissent. It is a pleasure to receive from the publishers a volume which can be so readily recommended as the *Complaint of Peace*. The translation of the *Querela Pacis* of Erasmus is, we are told, reprinted from a rare old English version, which is probably the 1802 reprint of the translation made by T. Paynell, but published anonymously. Anyhow, whoever made the translation did it well. It is limpid and quaint, containing just enough of the archaic to make the reading a delight. Desiderius Erasmus was a very human man. A humanist, who was no more humane than the rest of the wits and cynics of his time, there was in him a plenty of human weaknesses and uglinesses. Nevertheless he does strike occasionally a note that is genuinely human, universally true, accordant with all the race of men. And this is eminently so of the lamentings of Peace. The complaints which he puts in the mouth of Peace might have come from the lips of *Divae Pacis* any time during the past few years with as much verisimilitude as they did when Erasmus echoed them four centuries ago.

Erasmus is of course, *pro more suo*, pretty hard on the clergy. In this, however, he was probably not unjust, though his penchant to say a smart thing occasionally leads him to exaggerate the faults of his brethren. In one place he mentions Leo (the Tenth) and calls him "a really religious pontiff." However, the editor of the translation (would it be rash to call him Paul Carus?) is truculent enough to take the life of this single child of Erasmus's good will to the Pope, by a nasty little stab which thrusts itself up from the margin: "Erasmus was mistaken in Leo's character." There are only a very few footnotes to the entire text. One of them contains a faulty Latin quotation and a misprint; another, the above, aims a shaft at Leo. But was Erasmus mistaken, or is the *Chicago editor*? The former knew Leo personally, the latter surely does not. Paul Carus has access to no source of information which was not an open book to Erasmus.

Names That Live in Catholic Hearts, by Anna T. Sadlier, which made its first appearance in 1882, has now made its reappearance in a new impression. Or is only the title-page new? It should have been revised at least, so far as to obliterate "modifying" for *moderate* on the very first page. The "names that live" are Cardinal Ximenes, Michael Angelo, Samuel de Champlain, Archbishop Plunkett, Charles Carroll, Henri de Larochefajacquein, Simon de Montfort. If in all Catholic hearts all these names do *not* live, each is surely deserving of so desirable a place. (Benziger Bros., New York.)

Apropos of the labor movement, an interesting book on which is elsewhere reviewed in the present number, a recent monograph entitled *Collective Bargaining in the Lithographic Industry*, by H. E. Hoagland, Ph. D., will appeal to those who are interested in the study of Unionism. The writer limits his investigation to the industry of lithography, and consequently is able to show with fuller detail the results of collective bargaining.

He notes four stages in the method of wage determination: (1) by custom; (2) by union dictation; (3) by mutual agreement between unions and employers' associations. The results of each of these processes are duly indicated, and the general conclusion is reached that in every stage of collective bargaining the balance of power rests temporarily with the party which at that particular time is able to manipulate the adjustment between the supply of and the demand for labor. The success in this respect of one union has consisted in its policy of (4) restrictive apprenticeship. Professor Hoagland's monograph is issued in the *Columbia Studies* (No. 176. Longmans, Green & Co., New York).

The Institute of Mary, founded by Mother Mary Ward in 1607 at Paris, and subsequently established in England and still later in Ireland, is not so well known in the United States, its only mission here being, we believe, at Joliet, Illinois. In Canada, however, it is widely spread and is doing very efficient educational work. It was there established in 1847. The little band of nuns came from Dublin and began their first mission at Toronto. Their Superior was Mother Teresa Dease who directed the labors of the Institute until her death at Loretto Abbey, Toronto, 1 July, 1889. The *Life and Letters of Rev. Mother Teresa Dease* have been edited by a Member of the Community and recently published by Herder (St. Louis). Like the history of every religious foundation and the life of every saintly religious foundress, the story of the Institute in Canada under the guidance of Mother Teresa is instructive and edifying.

Even souls who live habitually in communion with God require at times external aids to devotion. Some change of imagery suggested by language, written or spoken, is occasionally found to be helpful. Persons who are not gifted with power of concentration on things of the spirit can hardly get along at all without extraneous helps. Perhaps the majority of Catholics find a prayer-book useful in preparing for and in making thanksgiving after Holy Communion. Certainly children are on the whole helpless without this auxiliary. Fortunately Catholics are not without devotional books of the kind needed; but, since novelty lends interest, the recent little book entitled *A Companion for Daily Communion*, arranged by a Sister of St. Joseph (Toronto, Canada), may be welcomed. The aim of the writer has been to associate mental with vocal prayer. Accordingly, "the considerations" and "the representations" always precede "the acts," and the latter are usually suggestions rather than formalized prayers. It is a reasonable, a solid, and a devotional method. The book is handy and well made by the Paulist Press, New York.

In a slender volume of some four-score pages are gathered together *Verses of Thirty Years Ago*, by the Rev. Michael McDonough, author of *One Year with God*. The writer modestly refuses to dignify his verses with the almost "sacred names" of "poetry and poem." A scholastic might meet the demurral half-way with a *distinguo*—*virtualiter*, nego, *actualiter* subdistinguo—*totaliter*, transeat, *partialiter*, nego; which, being interpreted, meaneth that the spirit of poetry pervades the verses and is felt throughout. That it is actually present in every verse the metaphysical critic may decline to discuss (*transeat*). That it is really present in most of the verses he insists. Indeed one may regret that the author of the verses has not felt himself free to touch with chisel and mallet the form he gave to them thirty years ago. Here and there a blow, an excision of an angle, or the smoothing down or rounding out of a curve

would have made the verses approach still more closely to the dignity of poetry. (Angel Guardian Press, Boston.)

Our Lady's Sodalists are being well supplied with aids to their chosen devotion. The Apostleship of Prayer (New York) issue the *Sodality Book*. It is described as a "general manual for Sodalities of Our Lady aggregated to the Prima Primaria." The booklet comprises, in the first place, the approved canon law, the history and rules of the Sodality; secondly, there is a full description of the Sodality's traditional ceremonial; and lastly, it gives the Office and a collection of devotions and pious practices, which should "keep our Sodalities up to the mark and worthy of the splendid services their Act of Consecration binds them to seek to realize." The fact that the manual has been compiled by Father Elder Mullan, S.J., is a guarantee of correctness and solidity. Though containing 250 pages, the volume is very small and convenient. On the other hand, it had been better to sacrifice some of this advantage by the use of a more opaque paper.

The *Manual of the Children of Mary*, issued by Gill & Sons (Dublin), is a neat little volume nicely printed, and bound in blue. The blank formula inserted in front shows that it is meant to be given to or purchased by the candidates on their reception. Besides the usual devotional features, the book contains a wealth of instructions and considerations adapted to the Child of Mary on her duties in the various circumstances of life. Would that Catholic maidens would heed the sensible advice it gives, especially on dress and manners.

The Catholic Truth Society (London) has recently issued, in a wee booklet entitled *God's Truth*, four sermons preached by Fr. Herbert Lucas, S.J., at St. George's Church, Worcester, England. Truth is considered successively in relation to duty, authority, freedom, charity. The little brochure is certainly a *multum in parvo* and, being so handy and neat and so well written, it is just what one would like to give to a non-Catholic friend.

Doctor James J. Walsh's well known "Dont's" which were published some time ago in *America*, have been taken up, rewritten, and rearranged with a special eye to English use, by Mr. G. S. Boulger, F. L. S., F. G. S. They are published in a slender brochure by the English Catholic Truth Society (London).

Other recent and timely booklets published by the C. T. S. are a *Little Pocket Book for Soldiers and Retreat Notes*. The former is not a prayer book, but a treasury of golden thoughts such as a sensible man can and, if he be tolerably decent, will appreciate. Both their matter and their form are a warrant for this. The booklet will fit into the smallest pocket.

Retreat Notes is a brochure containing thoughts gathered by the writer at Retreat Conferences. They cover less than fifty pages, but these are packed with ideas that sink deep and live long.

In June 1916 the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World convened in Philadelphia. One topic discussed was church advertising and the outcome was the organization of a Church Advertising and Publicity Department of the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World. A selection from the addresses delivered on the occasion by ministers and laymen has been collected in a compact volume *Church Advertising: Its Why and How* (pp. 200): published by the J. B. Lippincott Company (Philadelphia). While the subject does not on the whole appeal to the Catholic clergy, one could wish that the spiritual value of publicity were at least so far appreciated by our brethren as to secure more general attention to the placing, in hotels and railway stations, placards announcing the location of nearby Catholic churches and the hours of Mass therein. The reading of the little volume might serve to stimulate this good work and perhaps suggest certain other points of practical value.

Books Received.

BIBLICAL.

LEAVES OF GOLD. From the Books of Proverbs, Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus. Compiled by Fiona McKay, editor of *The Hills of Contemplation*, etc. (*The Angelus Series*). Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1916. Pp. 143. Price, \$0.50.

THEOLOGICAL.

THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. Part II (Second Part). Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. First Number (QQ. I.—XLVI.) Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. vi-596. Price, \$2.75.

THE SACRAMENTS. A Dogmatic Treatise by the Right Rev. Mgr. Joseph Pohle, D.D., formerly Professor of Apologetics at the Catholic University of America. Authorized English translation by Arthur Preuss. Vol. IV: Extreme Unction, Holy Orders and Matrimony. B. Herder: St. Louis and London. 1917. Pp. 249. Price \$1.50.

ESCHATOLOGY or the Catholic Doctrine of the Last Things. A Dogmatic Treatise by the Right Rev. Joseph Pohle, D.D., formerly Professor of Apologetics at the Catholic University of America. Authorized Version with some abridgment and additional references by Arthur Preuss. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo. and London. 1917. Pp. 164. Price \$1.00.

THE WORK OF ST. OPTATUS, BISHOP OF MILEVIS, AGAINST THE DONATISTS. With Appendix. Translated into English with Notes Critical, Explanatory, Theological and Historical. By the Rev. O. R. Vassall-Phillips, B. A., Balliol College, Oxford, Priest of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1917. Pp. xxxv-438. Price, \$4.00 net.

MANUEL DES FIDÈLES POUR LE SERVICE D'ENTERREMENT. Par Jean-Baptiste Allard. J. Gabalda, Paris. 1916. Pp. 168. Prix 1 fr. 25.

SERMON NOTES. By the late Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson. Edited by the Rev. C. C. Martindale, S.J., first series: Anglican. Longmans, Green, & Co., New York and London. 1917. Pp. viii-145. Price \$1.25, net.

SOLUTION OF THE GREAT PROBLEM. Translated by E. Leahy. From the French of Abbé Delloue, Military Chaplain at Soissons (Past Student of l'École Polytechnique). From second revised French edition. Frederick Pustet Co., New York and Cincinnati. 1917. Pp. 279. Price, \$1.25 net.

LITURGICAL.

BREVIARIARIUM ROMANUM, editio juxta typicam a S. R. C. approbatam in qua *Psalterium cum Ordinario per extensum compositum est*. 4 volumes, printed on India paper, size 32 mo, 5 x 3¾ inches; weight 9 ozs. per volume; Morocco, limp, round corners, gilt edges, net \$8.00. M. H. Gill and Son, Dublin; B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, Mo.

HISTORICAL.

THE MONKS OF WESTMINSTER, Being a Register of the Brethren of the Convent from the Time of the Confessor to the Dissolution. With lists of the Obedientiaries, and an Introduction. By E. H. Pearce, M. A., Canon and Archdeacon of Westminster. Cambridge University Press, London and Edinburgh; G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1916. Pp. x-236. Price, 10/ (\$3.00), net.

SAINTE PAULE (347-404). Par le R. P. Raymond Génier, des Frères Prêcheurs. ("Les Saints.") J. Gabalda, Paris. 1917. Pp. xii—201. Prix, 2 fr.

THE CHURCH AND THE WORKER. Before and after the Encyclical "Rerum Novarum." By Virginia M. Crawford. London: Catholic Social Guild. No. 1. B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.

LIFE OF MADEMOISELLE LE GRAS (Louise De Marillac.) Foundress of the Sisters of Charity. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 398. Price \$0.50, net.

LIFE OF ST. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA. By Father Genelli, S.J. Benziger Bros. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 398. Price \$0.50, net.

WOMEN OF CATHOLICITY. Memoirs of Margaret O'Carroll, Isabella of Castile, Margaret Roper, Marie de l'Incarnation. Marguerite Bourgeoys, Ethan Allen's Daughter. By Anna T. Sadlier, author of *Names that Live in Catholic Hearts*, etc. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 264. Price \$0.50, net.

THE CHURCH AND SCIENCE. By Sir Bertram C. A. Windle, M. A., M. D., etc., President of University College, Dublin. London: Catholic Truth Society: St. Louis: B. Herder. 1917. Pp. 415. Price \$3.00.

LES CATHOLIQUES AU SERVICE DE LA FRANCE. II. Les Diocèses de l'Intérieur: Lyon, Bourges, Nantes, Rouen, Aix, Marseille, Lourdes. Par Paul Delay. Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1917. Pp. 330. Prix, 3 fr. 50.

L'ÉGLISE DE FRANCE DURANT LA GUERRE (Août 1914—Décembre 1916). Par Georges Goyau. (No. 106, "*Pages actuelles*," 1914-1917). Bloud & Gay, Paris et Barcelone. 1917. Pp. 67. Prix 0 fr. 60.

PER CRUCEM AD LUCEM. Lettres Pastorales, Discours, Allocutions etc. Par Cardinal Mercier, Archevêque de Malines, Primat de Belgique. Préface de Monseigneur A. Baudrillart, Recteur de l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Sixième édition. Bloud & Gay, Paris et Barcelone. Pp. 336. Prix, 3 fr. 50.

MISCELLANEOUS.

CHRISTOPHER COLUMBUS IN POETRY, HISTORY, AND ART. By Sara Agnes Ryan. Illustrated. With an Introduction by the Rev. F. X. McCabe, C. M., LL.D., President of De Paul University, Chicago. The Mayer and Miller Co., Chicago. 1917. Pp. 259.

A SCALLOP SHELL OF QUIET. Introduced by Margaret L. Woods. (No. XII, *Adventurers All Series*. A Series of Young Poets Unknown to Fame.) B. H. Blackwell, Oxford; Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 1917. Pp. 79. Price, \$0.60 net.

CHURCH ADVERTISING; ITS WHY AND HOW. Papers delivered before the Church Advertising Section of the Twelfth Annual Convention of the Associated Advertising Clubs of the World. Compiled by W. B. Ashley, Executive Secretary, Church Advertising and Publicity Department; formerly Associate Editor, *Christian Herald*. Seven photographic illustrations. J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia. 1917. Pp. 200. Price, \$1.00 net.

AN UNWILLING TRAVELLER. By Mary Donovan. B. Herder: London and St. Louis, Mo. Pp. 240. Price 80 cents.

5. Politico-religious ideal. The separation of Church and State has been advocated by universal Masonry with the view of freeing the State from the influence of the Church, and of making it impossible for ecclesiastical organizations to use the physical force of the State in the interest of the Church. So far, so good. In Latin Masonry, however, where the politico-religious phase of the brotherhood's program dominates all others, the kind of separation of Church and State aimed at is in reality a firm control of the Church by the State, a shackling of the Church in her legitimate sphere, and a utilization of the secular arm in the interest of irreligion and anti-Catholicism.

As the Latin Masons' chief concern in the politico-religious field is with education, let us try to grasp their viewpoint. "It is true that clericalism and Roman Catholicism are fundamentally the same thing." But do not try to destroy it all at once. The task is too big. Take it piecemeal. "First of all let us deal with the religious congregations. It is the congregations that we find first in the fields of education and charity. They are the advance guard of the clerical army."³⁵ It may at first sight appear intolerant to suppress the congregations. But no. Liberty necessarily has its limits. Liberty to work harm is license, and the congregations do harm to their own members, to society at large and to those who do not belong to the congregations. Hence "it is necessary to destroy them entirely."³⁶

Education must be lay as well as compulsory, for if you allow schools in which religion is taught, "you will see the children frequent them" instead of the public schools,³⁷ and three-quarters of the children of the elementary grades would come under clerical control.³⁸ It may look like oppression to deprive the parents of the right to secure for their children a religious education. But here again, no. "What right has a father to impose this or that religion, this or that doctrine on his son? . . . Strictly speaking, you have no right to teach any but demonstrated truths. . . . Thus we ought to safeguard

³⁵ F. . A. ., in *Bull. du Gr. . Or. . de Belgique*, 1901, 68, quoted in L. Mallié, *La Maçonnerie belge*, Bruxelles, 1906, 227-8.

³⁶ Limousin, in *L'Acacia*, Paris, 1903, i, 140-59.

³⁷ Grün, quoted by Mallié, *l. c.*, 180.

³⁸ *Bull. Gr. . Or. . de Belgique*, 1892-3, 98-9, quoted *ibid.*, 195-6.

the absolute liberty of this defenceless creature, the child, against any and all propagandists, be they Christians or Jews, Protestants or Mohammedans." ³⁹ This view was not peculiar to the writer, but was and no doubt is largely shared by "the younger generation" of his Masonic confrères.⁴⁰

The quotations speak for themselves. The point I wish to emphasize is this: the concept of liberty is so fundamental in the Masonic ideal that even where extreme measures of what we in America would call intolerance and oppression are advocated and carried into execution, this is done in the name of liberty, and the Masonic apologist's chief interest is ostensibly to square his extremist program with the concept of liberty.

Let us touch briefly on what we may call Masonic reactions. They will illustrate the same point. Masonry has shown a marked sympathy with the ancient mystery cults. This is partly due no doubt to the rich symbolism and a certain esotericism which characterized them, but we may also recall that these cults were not state-enforced, had no binding dogmas in the proper sense, allowed their devotees full freedom of thought, and claimed little or no real authority for their priest-hoods. Masonry again draws largely upon the ancient philosophies and religions, particularly Neo-Platonism and that strange hybrid, Gnosticism. These philosophies were often at odds with the orthodox priesthoods of the day, while Neo-Platonism and Gnosticism bitterly antagonized early dogmatic Christianity. Incidentally we may note that here and there in modern Masonic literature even the universities are gently scored for their scientific dogmatism.⁴¹

Masonry has fused with Protestantism, at least with the more or less rationalistic wing of Protestantism, in proportion as Protestantism has in various lands drifted away from binding orthodoxy. With orthodox Protestantism it is often at odds. It has sharply reacted against Roman Catholicism, and even against Greek. And where it attacks Catholicism, it does so almost exclusively on the theme of liberty, and only very rarely

³⁹ A. Bellanger, in *L'Acacia*, i, 1903, 225.

⁴⁰ Limousin, *ibid.*, 556-68. Cf. also the excellent summary of the whole question by M. Le François, in *Revue de Lille*, 1908-9, xxvii, 3d ser. iii, 31-59, 122-31 and in his *Plan maçonnique*, 9-44.

⁴¹ Oswald Wirth, *La Franc-Maçonnerie rendue intelligible à ses adeptes Le livre de l'apprenti*. Paris, [1894], 2.

for ethical failings. The society's reactions, sympathetic and antagonistic, to actual governments are in the main controlled, as we have seen, by the same law of liberty, or what at times and in places Masonry considers liberty.

The foregoing summarized evidence, pointing to the concept of individual autonomy as the dominant one of Masonry, could easily be reinforced, did space permit. As Catholics, we can sympathize with a large part of this program of liberty, but on the other hand we should call certain sections of it by other names.

MASONRY AND SOCIALISM.

In its quest of freedom Masonry failed to champion one important phase of freedom, and this failure may prove the society's undoing. Give us individual freedom, religious, intellectual, ethical, and political, and all will be well with the world. This has been the ever-recurring burden of the battle-hymn of Masonry. Not at all, reply Marx and his legions; you are leaving the prince out of the play. Your boasted freedom has brought prosperity to the bourgeoisie, but has reduced the masses to slavery. You did well in your day. You won your spurs—but you have lost them. We are going to use the conquests you have made to attain the final and supreme victory, the unshackling, especially the economic unshackling, of the proletariat.

The antagonism is deep-rooted. It is first of all a social and economic one. The last two centuries or more have been marked chiefly by the rise of the bourgeoisie, of the middle classes, to supremacy over the aristocratic and regal groups. Now comes the further step, the struggle of the working classes, the masses, the proletariat, for supremacy over the bourgeoisie. Masonry's associations, sympathies, and interests have been with the middle classes, Socialism's are with the working classes.

Masonry in its infancy was largely aristocratic in membership, and English and Prussian Masonry are still partly so. But the great bulk of Masons are recruited from the bourgeoisie.⁴² This is particularly the case among the Latins; and

⁴² ECCLES. REVIEW, June, 1917, lvi, 592-3; cf. also Mallié, *l. c.*, 148, 150, 152-3; *Bull. des travaux du S. C. de Belgique*, no. 28, pp. 202, 244; *Latomia*, Leipzig, 1898, xxi, 44; *Freemason's Repository*, Providence, R. I., 1894-5, xxiv, 9.

even in the United States fraternities like the Odd Fellows and Knights of Pythias are nearer to the masses than is the Masonic fraternity. Broadly speaking, Masonry represents the well-to-do and educated middle classes. It manifests a certain aloofness from the masses; it claims the responsibility of leadership; and it tends to advocate government by the more educated of the people. It is to a certain extent exclusive, not only as being a secret society, but as selecting its candidates and passing upon their fitness before admitting them. Being recruited from the bourgeoisie, its interests and hence its economic views are largely the interests and economic views of the bourgeoisie. Being inspired largely by rationalism and the ideal of individual liberty, it has been inclined apparently to rest content with the *laissez-faire* economic theory which was the offspring of rationalism,⁴³ and which jumps with the ideal of individual liberty; and which incidentally has gone far to advance the material interests of the bourgeoisie. Being mostly a fairly prosperous group, Masons have naturally considered that true happiness comes not from material prosperity, but from idealistic sources. Having largely attained the ends the society set itself out to attain, it has, except in parts of Latin Masonry, become conservative and desirous of maintaining the *status quo*.

Socialism on the contrary recruits chiefly from the proletariat. Broadly speaking, it represents the less prosperous element in our midst, most of whom have not had the advantages of education. Its sympathies are frankly with the masses; it claims leadership for the masses, and advocates government by the masses. As an organization, it is neither secret nor exclusive, but rather the reverse. Being recruited from the proletariat, its interests and economic views are those of the proletariat. Representing the victims of the *laissez-faire* policy, it has in so far rejected this phase of rationalism and of individual liberty, and substituted the theory of popular ownership of industries as making for the material interests of the proletariat, against the well-to-do bourgeoisie. Being mostly poor in this world's goods, the Socialists have naturally emphasized material interests as a source, if not the chief source, of happiness. Their theory of economic justice being

⁴³ Stephen, ii, 321-2.

still far from realization, they are not content with the *status quo* and are in so far revolutionary.

In the second place, one of Masonry's avowed objects is to unite and reconcile men of various views, interests, creeds, classes, nations, and races. Fraternity is one of its cardinal virtues. Socialism, the more radical wing in particular, preaches on the contrary class hatred and class war.

In the third place, Masonry aims at the minimum of restriction on personal liberty. But most independent observers are of the conviction that the Socialists' scheme of government would very largely restrict personal liberty. Akin to this is the fact that Masonry aims at the development and betterment of the individual primarily, while Socialism rather deals primarily with the group.

Finally, Socialism's sympathies with irreligion and materialism have served to repel the Anglo-Saxon and Germanic Masonic bodies, although these sympathies have been a bond of union with the Latin bodies.

Let us now pass from ideas to facts. In the United States, Socialism does not oppose Masonry, nor on the other hand does the latter ever require an applicant to renounce Socialism. Some Masons are Socialists, but it seems that "for the most part, the majority of Masons would be found to have decidedly capitalistic leanings."⁴⁴ The subject is little discussed by American Masons. Apart from occasional expressions of neutrality or sympathy,⁴⁵ most of the references I have met are unfavorable to Socialism, some vehemently so.⁴⁶ At times it is bracketed with communism.⁴⁷

The German Masons are openly opposed to the Socialist movement, chiefly, so it appears, on the ground of its materialistic philosophy and its limitation of individual liberty.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Rich. Pride, then editor, in *American Tyler-Keystone*, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1912, xxvi, 537; cf. R. C. Wright, *ibid.*, 536-7.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*; *New Age Magazine*, Washington, D. C., 1915, xxiii, 55-7, and 1917, xxv, 31-3.

⁴⁶ *New Age*, 1914, xxi, 158 and 1917, xxv, 21, 33; *Amer. Tyler-K.*, xxiii, 172. Pound, *l. c.*, 78-9, Cf. Newton, 248-9, and Pike, *Morals and Dogma*, 53.

⁴⁷ J. D. Richardson, *Allocation of 1903*, Washington, 1903 25. Cf. also *Amer. Tyler-K.*, xxiii, 172.

⁴⁸ Keller, *Freimaurerei* 124-5. Cf. also, ditto, *Die geistigen Strömungen d. Gegenwart*, 3. Aufl., in *Vortr. u. Aufsätze aus d. Comenius-Ges.*, xviii. Jahrg., 5. Stück, Jena, 1910, 6; D. Bischoff, *Soziale Frage*, *ibid.*, XVI Jahrg., 2 Stück, Jena, 1908, 21-38; J. G. Findel, in *Signale f. d. deutsche Maurerwelt*, June, 1903,

Socialism, as noted above, has a good deal more in common with Latin Masonry than with Anglo-Saxon and Germanic, and in fact a certain *rapprochement* or coalition between Socialism and Masonry has obtained for a couple of decades in some of the Latin countries. This partial *rapprochement* was seemingly brought about by two causes. First, the Socialist Party was rapidly becoming a formidable rival of the Liberal, or, as it is called in France, the Republican Party, with which Masonry is identified.⁴⁹ Secondly, Masonry feared a coalition of the Catholic and Socialistic forces,⁵⁰ particularly after the publication of Leo XIII's Encyclical *Rerum novarum* on labor. At any rate the process of coalescence was distinctly accelerated, by the French and Belgian Masons in particular, just about the date of the Encyclical.

The advances of Masonry were not received entirely in good part. Many leading Socialists, it is true, became Masons, and vice versa. But the masses remained aloof. Agreement on a political platform was not found quite feasible. So the common issue was shifted to anti-clericalism.⁵¹ "La franc-maçonnerie unie au parti socialiste réaliserait enfin la destruction définitive des cléricatismes."⁵² But even in spite of this strong bond of sympathy, the fundamental antagonism between the two forces has checked full coöperation.⁵³ Both Masonry and Socialism are elastic, but this elasticity has its limits.

Recently Socialism has shown a tendency explicitly to repel the advances of Masonry. It is true that at the congress of French Socialists at Lyons five years ago the party by a nearly unanimous vote decided that its members should be left free to become Masons or not, but on the other hand the Neuchâtel Socialists about the same time voted in considerable majority

quoted in *L'Acacia*, i, 649; Neumann, in *Bauhütte*, quoted in *Amer. Tyler-K.*, xxvi, 468; E. Schultze, *Die Kulturaufgaben d. Freimaurerei*, Stuttgart-Berlin, 1912, 169, 209.

⁴⁹ Houzeau de Lehaie, elected Gr. . . M. . . of Gr. . . Or. . . of Belgium in 1893, quoted in Mallié, *l. c.*, 152-3; *ibid.*, 148, 150. Cf. Poppaert, in *Bull. Travaux du Supr. C. de Belgique*, no. 30, pp. 20, 22.

⁵⁰ Desmons, *ibid.*, no. 28, pp. 200-4; Blatin, quoted by Le François, *Plan maç.*, 131.

⁵¹ Mallié, *l. c.*, 153, 159-60, 164.

⁵² A. Lebey, "Le socialisme et la franc-maçonnerie," in *Revue socialiste*, Paris, 1910, lii, 256; cf. 259.

⁵³ Le François, *l. c.*, 131-2; Lebey, *l. c.*, 257, 363-4; *L'Acacia*, i, 128-35, 160-71, 412-3.

not to accept for public office any member of a secret society.⁵⁴ More recently, at the Italian Socialists' party congress of 1914, 27,378 voted to expel Masons from the party, 2,296 voted to demand that they withdraw, 2,485 considered that the question did not concern the party, and only 1,819 favored an alliance with Masonry.⁵⁵

Will Latin Masonry go in outright for collectivism? Le François thinks it will, if it be obliged to do so in order successfully to combat Catholicism.⁵⁶ Sassenbach, a Socialist, thinks not. "Individual Masons may be Socialists, but Masonry as such will never exercise a socialistic activity. No one can escape from his own skin, nor can the Masonic brethren. . . . Masonry was revolutionary so long as the bourgeoisie had cause for being revolutionary; as the widest bourgeoisie circles became reactionary, the Lodges became so too. It is nonsense to say that contemporary Masonry is revolutionary or works along real socialistic lines. Its activities are closely bound up with the thoughts and sentiments of the bourgeoisie from which it is recruited. And the bourgeoisie of to-day is reactionary."⁵⁷

THE VITALITY OF MASONRY.

A few words in conclusion on the popularity, the power, the vitality of Masonry. In Anglo-Saxon and Germanic lands particularly the sources of this popularity are largely the attractions of club-life and goodfellowship, as well as the advancement of personal interests.

Latin Masonry, on the other hand, is more of a political party. It is splendidly organized, and in turn is an expert organizer of scattered forces, as it proved, for instance, in the Portuguese Revolution of 1910, when it performed the task of uniting for common action the Carbonaria, the Acacia group, the Young Portugal Party, and the other isolated revolutionary forces.⁵⁸ It is an elastic organization and readily enters into alliance with other groups, as, recently, with Social-

⁵⁴ *Alpina* (Switzerland) of March 15, 1912, quoted in *Amer. Tyler-K.*, xxvi, 535.

⁵⁵ W. E. Walling and others, *The Socialism of To-day*, N. Y., 1916, 92; *Le mouvement socialiste*, Paris, Jan.-June, 1914, xxxv, 362-3.

⁵⁶ Le François, *l. c.*, 133.

⁵⁷ Sassenbach, *l. c.*, 70-1.

⁵⁸ F. Lorenzo y Díez, Portugal (*Cinco años de República*), Madrid, 1915, 39-40.

ism, or as, at the time of the French Revolution, with republicanism and Jacobinism—although its sympathies were then at first with constitutional monarchy.⁵⁹ It does not exactly dominate or control by sheer numbers the political situation in Latin countries, but is the thoroughly organized minority within the Liberal party, which works more or less as a unit, and coöperates with and to a certain extent swings the party.⁶⁰ It forms a minority, but an able and aggressive minority, within the Liberal party, and in turn the Liberal party can and does often carry through measures against the wishes of a majority of the people. The control of majorities by minorities is one of the commonplaces of political history, and Latin Masonry is an able, elastic, aggressive, and strongly organized minority. Its power has no doubt been frequently overestimated, but, on the other hand, its power is considerably greater than its numerical force.

Beyond, however, and beneath these social, economic, and political factors, we may, I think, safely say that Masonry has fundamentally appealed to and kept its hold upon modern generations, because it is the embodiment of a philosophy, the philosophy of rationalism, and of an ideal, the ideal of individual autonomy—a philosophy and ideal with whose growth Masonry has kept pace and in whose prosperous fortunes in the last two hundred years Masonry has bountifully shared.

What of the fraternity's future? In proportion as religious and political freedom become universal, will Masonry, for want of a goal still to be struggled for, languish, or be converted, as has largely been the case in Anglo-Saxon lands, into a society for relief, goodfellowship, and self-interest? Or, as a French writer puts it, will there still be work for Masonry to do so long as the masses remain "croyants et soumis" ⁶¹ and refractory to rationalism? Or will the proletariat under the flag of Socialism or some similar flag succeed in its battle for supremacy, and cripple and strangle the bourgeoisie's hegemony, and, with it, Masonry's power?

"We shall know when we find out"—and perhaps twenty-first-century humanity will be the first to find out.

JOHN M. COOPER.

Washington, D. C.

⁵⁹ Belletti, *l. c.*, 476.

⁶⁰ Hiram, in *L'Acacia*, i, 8, 178-80, 183-5, 187.

⁶¹ *L'Acacia*, i, 9-10.



Analecta.

ACTA BENEDIOTI XV.

EPISTOLA.

TERTIARIIS SAECULARIBUS S. FRANCISCI DATUR FACULTAS
BENEDICTIONIS SEU ABSOLUTIONIS RECIPIENDAE INTRA OCTI-
DUUM FESTIVITATUM QUIBUS EA EST ADNEXA.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Quae omnia ad Ecclesiae thesauris facilius perfruendum spectent, ea de more Romanorum Pontificum praestare libenti quidem animo solemus. Itaque cum dilectus filius Iosephus Antonius a S. Ioanne in Persiceto, Procurator et Commissarius Generalis Ordinis Fratrum Minorum Capulorum, humiles ad Nos preces admoverit, ut saecularibus tertiariis S. Francisci exoptatum privilegium concedere dignaremur; Nos, quibus sane est compertum, quot laudes inclytus hic tertiarius Franciscalis Ordo sibi in Ecclesiam et in civilem communitatem comparaverit, piis hisce precibus benigne obsecundamus. Quare de omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac SS. Petri et Pauli, Apostolorum Eius, auctoritate confisi, et audito quoque dilecto filio Nostro S. R. E. Card. Poenitentiario Maiore, omnibus ac singulis saecularibus fratribus tertii Ordinis S. Francisci Patris, ubicumque degentibus, facultatem apostolica auctoritate Nostra praesentium tenore facimus, cuius vi Absolutionem seu Benedictionem excipere,

servatis de iure servandis, valeant, quolibet die intra octiduum earum festivitatum, quibus eadem Benedictio est adnexa. In contrarium non obstantibus quibuscumque. Praesentibus perpetuo valituris.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XIV aprilis MCMXVII, Pontificatus Nostri anno tertio.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status*.

SUPREMA SACRA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII.

DE SPIRITISMO.

Feria III, loco IV, die 24 aprilis 1917.

In plenario conventu habito ab Emis ac Rmis Dnis Cardinalibus in rebus fidei et morum Inquisitoribus Generalibus, proposito dubio: "An liceat per *Medium*, ut vocant, vel sine *Medio*, adhibito vel non hypnotismo, locutionibus aut manifestationibus spiritisticis quibuscumque adsistere, etiam speciem honestatis vel pietatis praeseferentibus, sive interrogando animas aut spiritus, sive audiendo responsa, sive tantum aspiciendo, etiam cum protestatione tacita vel expressa nullam cum malignis spiritibus partem se habere velle."—Idem Emi ac Rmi Patres respondendum decreverunt: "*Negative in omnibus.*"

Et Feria v, die 26 eiusdem mensis, Ssmus D. N. D. Benedictus Div. Prov. PP. XV relatam sibi Emorum Patrum resolutionem adprobavit.

Datum Romae, ex aedibus Sancti Officii, die 17 aprilis 1917.

Aloisius Castellano, *S. R. et U. I. Notarius*.

SACRA CONGREGATIO DE RELIGIOSIS.

INTERPRETATIO DECRETI "CUM DE SACRAMENTALIBUS."

In articulo V Decreti *Cum de Sacramentalibus* diei 3 februarii 1913 statutum est: "Si qua religiosa ad animi sui quietem et maiorem in via Dei progressum, aliquem specialem confessorium vel moderatorem spirituales postulet, erit facile ab Ordinario concedendus; qui tamen invigilabit ne ex hac concessionem abusus irrepant; quod si irrepserint eos caute et prudenter eliminet, salva tamen conscientiae libertate".

Circa hunc articulum proposita sunt S. Congregationi de Religiosis sequentia dubia:

I. An confessarius specialis seu spiritualis moderator pro aliqua religiosa deputatus iuxta art. V Decreti *Cum de Sacramentalibus*, valeat perpetuo in suo munere permanere, vel potius concedendus sit ad tempus praefixum.

II. An deputari valeat in confessarium specialem seu conscientiae moderatorem alicuius religiosae, qui in decurso triennio confessarii ordinarii communitatis munere functus sit, nondum a cessatione praedicti officii anno expleto.

Emi Patres Cardinales huius S. Congregationis de Religiosis, tota rei ratione mature perpensa, in plenario coetu habito die 20 aprilis currentis anni 1917 responderunt:

Ad primum: Specialem confessarium seu moderatorem spiritualem concedendum esse non ad tempus praefixum, sed donec perduret iusta causa necessitatis vel utilitatis spiritualis religiosae, quae postulaverit, ad normam Decreti *Cum de Sacramentalibus*, sub n. 13.

Ad secundum: Affirmative.

Facta autem de hisce omnibus relatione ab infrascripto Secretario Sacrae Congregationis, in audientia diei 22 eiusdem mensis aprilis, Sanctitas Sua Emorum Patrum sententiam benigne ratam habuit et confirmavit.

I. CARD. TONTI, *Praefectus*.

L. * S.

✠ Adulphus, Ep. Canopitan., *Secretarius*.

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA.

Sectio de Indulgentiis.

VULGANTUR DOCUMENTA QUAEDAM CONCESSIONIS INDULGENTIARUM.

I.

“Cor Iesu Eucharisticum, adauge nobis fidem, spem et charitatem”.

Concedimus indulgentiam trecentorum dierum fidelibus praedictam invocationem devote recitantibus.

Ex Aedibus Vaticanis, die 5^a aprilis, Feria V in Coena Domini, anno 1917.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

Praeentis concessionis authenticum documentum, prout de iure, exhibitum fuit Sacrae Poenitentiariae Apostolicae, Sectione de Indulgentiis, hac die 17 aprilis 1917.

In fidem, etc.

Bernardus Colombo, *S. P. Regens.*

L. * S.

II.

“ 1. Signore nostro, Gesù Cristo, noi ricorriamo a Voi; Dio santo, Dio grande, Dio immortale, abbiate pietà di noi e di tutto il genere umano. Purificateci dai nostri peccati e dalle nostre debolezze col Vostro Sangue divino. Amen.

“ 2. Gesù mio, in Voi credo, in Voi spero, Voi amo, a Voi mi dono.

“ Madre mia santissima, datemi confidenza in Voi.

“ Quando, Gesù mio, vedrò la Vostra bella faccia?

“ O Maria, Voi siete la fortezza mia, la liberazione, la pace e la salute mia.”

Concediamo trecento giorni d'indulgenza, applicabili alle anime del purgatorio, per ogni volta che si recitano queste preghiere.

Dal Vaticano, 21 dicembre 1916.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

Praeentis concessionis authenticum exemplar huic S. Tribunali Poenitentiariae Apostolicae, Sectione de Indulgentiis, prout de iure exhibitum fuit.

In fidem, etc. Die 20 aprilis 1917.

Bernardus Colombo, *S. P. Regens.*

L. * S.

 ROMAN CURIA.

OFFICIAL LIST OF RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

26 February: Monsignor Daniel M. Gorman, LL.D., of the Archdiocese of Dubuque, made Protonotary Apostolic *ad instar participantium*.

27 February: Monsignor Arthur M. Clark, A.M., of the Archdiocese of Dubuque, made Domestic Prelate.

11 March: Monsignor Patrick M. Cushnahan, V.G., of the Diocese of Salt Lake, made Domestic Prelate.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

LETTER OF POPE BENEDICT XV permitting the secular members of the Third Order of St. Francis to receive the Blessing or Absolution on any day within the octaves of those feasts to which the Blessing is attached.

SUPREME S. CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY OFFICE issues a decree forbidding attendance at spiritistic séances of any kind.

S. CONGREGATION OF RELIGIOUS answers two doubts concerning the decree *Cum de Sacramentalibus*, on the confessors of religious.

S. PENITENTIARY APOSTOLIC gives the text of six short indulgenced prayers.

ROMAN CURIA officially announces recent pontifical appointments.

NEWMAN'S ARGUMENT FROM CONSCIENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In an article entitled "The Native Capacity of Reason to Know God", which appeared in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW for June, 1917, there is a passage upon which I hope you will allow me to make one or two comments. I do not write with any controversial purpose, but in order to correct a mistake, which, quite contrary to Father Harrington's intention, may result in a grave injustice to one of the ablest and staunchest defenders of Catholic Truth in the nineteenth century.

The passage I refer to is the following: "It [the argument from conscience] has a fine tinge of Modernism about it, although Newman himself would be the last to support such a movement in Catholic philosophy . . . Conscience is not an inner sense by which we perceive religious truths. This is the doctrine of Schleiermacher. It is Newman's theory pressed to its logical conclusion. It finds expression in the subconscious immanence of the Modernists, and in practice it opens

wide the door to every kind of religious extravagance" (pp. 578-9).

The argument from conscience, as employed by Newman and many Scholastic authors, bears no relation whatever, even the remotest, to the subconscious immanence of the Modernists. The argument from conscience amounts very briefly to this: Every man, whatever his condition or religion, is conscious that some things *must* be done, and some things *must not* be done, that he *ought* to do this, and he *ought not* to do that. When he does what he ought to do, he is conscious that his action is approved; and when he does what he ought not to do, he is conscious of being rebuked. Mankind has in all ages of the world called this approval and rebuke the voice of conscience. But what is implied in this consciousness of "must" and "ought", in this imperious, constraining obligation from which, in spite of our utmost efforts, we cannot escape? There must be a Being, to whom we are subject in all our thoughts, words, and actions, an all-seeing Judge, supreme and absolute, independent of us, upon whom we are utterly dependent, who passes judgment upon all the details of our conduct.

This description does not do justice to the argument from conscience,—far from it; it is only a faint and inadequate outline. But meagre as it is, it is sufficient to show that the argument from conscience has not a tinge of Modernism about it. The philosophy of Modernism is subjectivistic; it is a hodge-podge of Kantianism, Pragmatism, and Bergsonism. This philosophy *denies* that we can prove the existence of an all-seeing, supreme Judge, who is independent of us.

Some remark should be made upon the following words of Father Harrington: "Conscience is not an inner sense by which we perceive religious truths. This is the doctrine of Schleiermacher." It is true that we cannot perceive *all* religious truths by means of conscience. But starting with the dictates of conscience we can arrive at a knowledge of many *natural* truths of religion, as distinguished from supernatural truths. In Wilmers's *Handbook of the Christian Religion* occur the following passages: "Natural religion would teach, for instance, that God is our Creator and our last end; that He is wise, powerful, bountiful; that there is a difference between good and evil; that we owe God homage; that murder

and theft are wrong; etc. A man who reflects on himself and on nature around him may gain such truths by the *light of reason*" (p. 4). "Revelation is *natural in form* when it is communicated through nature. . . . From the created universe we infer the existence of the Creator as well as His power, wisdom, and goodness. From conscience, which approves some actions as good, and condemns others as evil; which restrains us from the latter, and urges us on to the former; which rebukes us for these, and commends us for those—we infer the existence of a divine law-giver, judge, and avenger" (p. 7).

Schleiermacher's error, which is the error of the Modernists, did not consist in asserting that we could learn some of the natural truths of religion from conscience, but in maintaining that the distinctive truths of *Christianity* could be acquired without the aid of a supernatural revelation.

The following words of Father Harrington also call for comment: "'Though,' he [Newman] says, 'if I lost my sense of the moral deformity of my acts, I should not therefore lose my sense that they were forbidden to me.' But we know that conscience speaks to us because we have a knowledge of God or His laws from other sources, for example that certain things are wrong, intrinsically evil, against the natural law, and certain things are wrong, because they are prohibited, whereas if they are not prohibited to us, our reason could see nothing in them but good" (p. 579). This last sentence is allowed to stand without proof, though it is very far from self-evident. In fact, unless it is qualified, it is not true. I may be mistaken, but I understand Father Harrington to say that we cannot know from conscience that certain things are intrinsically evil, unless we have a knowledge of God or His laws from other sources. But it is a fundamental doctrine of Christian ethics that we can know from conscience that certain actions are intrinsically evil whether we know that God has forbidden them or not. Such actions are wrong in themselves, not because they are forbidden. In delineating what conscience teaches us concerning God, Newman confines himself to acts which are intrinsically evil or intrinsically good. Father Harrington has not accurately quoted Newman. In the passage from which Father Harrington quotes, Newman refers distinctly to acts of *dishonesty*. These are Newman's words:

"Though I lost my sense of the obligation which I lie under to abstain from acts of dishonesty, I should not in consequence lose my sense that such actions were an outrage offered to my moral nature. Again; though I lost my sense of their moral deformity, I should not therefore lose my sense that they were forbidden to me" (*Grammar of Assent*, p. 106).

Newman is not alone in laying stress on the argument from conscience. Many scholastic writers have used it. Moreover, this is not the only argument employed by Newman. He also has recourse to the argument from the order in the visible universe and to the argument for a First Cause.

When the Encyclical on Modernism appeared, the Modernists in England exhibited an extreme anxiety to associate Newman with themselves. During January, 1908, I published in the London *Tablet* a series of articles in answer to their contentions. It would indeed have been a tremendous advantage to them, could they have connected with their cause a man of such keen and penetrating intellect as Newman. But their efforts were futile. Pope Pius X put an end to their hopes by sending an autograph letter to Bishop O'Dwyer of Limerick in which he completely exonerated Newman from any connexion, whether in sympathy or in principle, with the tenets of Modernism.

I think I may have mistaken Father Harrington's meaning or drift in the sentences I have quoted from him. If so, I sincerely beg his pardon. I repeat that my purpose in writing is not to attack Father Harrington's paper, but to correct an impression which certain sentences in it are apt to leave in the minds of his readers.

JOHN J. TOOHEY, S.J.

Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

A LAYMAN'S REFLECTIONS ON HIS PASTOR'S ELOQUENCE.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Whilst I enjoy a good discourse on secular subjects, my taste is distinctly partial to sacred oratory. When I hear a good sermon, I have the satisfaction of knowing that what I am lending my ear to is not merely of ephemeral, but of eternal interest; that I am being not entertained and delighted only,

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(LVII).—SEPTEMBER, 1917.—No. 3.

EDWARD SORIN, O.S.O., AT NOTRE DAME UNIVERSITY.

THE celebration this year of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the foundation of Notre Dame University directs attention anew to one of the most remarkable among the heroic figures that have illustrated the history of the Catholic Church in the United States during the last century.

Not only as a pioneer in the religious work of primary and higher education does Father Edward Sorin stand out prominent among the great leaders of civilization in the New World, but also as a founder of the first actual organization of national hospital service, such as is now being widely heralded under the title of the American Red Cross. When, at the outbreak of our Civil War in 1861, the Government called for volunteers to attend the sick and wounded in our military hospitals and on the battlefield, Mother Angela of the Sisters of the Holy Cross, at the instigation of Father Sorin, took some sixty-five sisters from the school-rooms, and sent them at once into special training for the service of the sick and wounded. For five years these nuns maintained an organized corps of nurses for the benefit of our country's soldiers. These facts have not as yet found their full valuation in our national history; though they are written, I believe, in our war records. They demonstrate that the spontaneous charity of the Catholic religious Orders is ever a first element at the service of patriotism and humanity, even while its workers claim no reward of earthly glory or material compensation.

The annals of the Congregation of the Holy Cross, to which Father Sorin belonged, have it that he entered the harbor of

New York, on the sailing vessel "Iowa", from France, on the 13 September, 1841. That was the eve of the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, a beautiful omen for the sons of the saintly priest, Father Moreau, who had founded his Order under the glorious title and standard of Christ.

The little band of seven pilgrims, whose leadership had been entrusted to the young priest, Edward Sorin, then barely 27 years of age, was to carry its banner onto the sloping plains and into the forests of Indiana, a country where more than half a century before, Father Pierre Gibault had ventured to plant the first American flag, yet where settlers and traders were still at the mercy of distrustful Indian marauders. Pioneers of the army of Christ had followed the *coureurs des bois* into these regions two centuries before. There were traces of the Cross which Father Allouez, the Jesuit explorer, Claude Aveneau, James Gravier, and the intrepid Chardon had brought thither. Others had come and gone after them at intervals; but just then there was sore need of spiritual ministration in this open territory, organized as the diocese of Vincennes but a few years earlier (1834). The see's jurisdiction extended over the whole State of Indiana and about one-third of the State of Illinois. There were at the time only two resident priests in Indiana—Fathers Lalumière and Ferneding. The Abbé St. Cyr, who made his home in Chicago, was practically the only priest in Illinois. Father Badin, who was then an old man, had established a mission station at South Bend, whither he had come from time to time from Louisville. In 1840 some valiant women, Sisters of Providence, had opened an Indian school in the neighborhood, and Bishop de la Hailandière had prevailed on Father Moreau, the superior in Mans, France, to send him the Brothers of the Holy Cross. Father Sorin brought with him four professed Brothers of the Order, and two young novices who, though only fifteen years of age, were full of courage and holy zeal. When, after a voyage of six weeks as steerage passengers, they arrived in the city of New York, the venerable Bishop Dubois received them. He was ready to have them share his modest episcopal home for an indefinite time; but they remained only three days, impatient to get to their destination. The way to Indiana was toilsome, as poverty obliged them to choose a route that

was cheap and tedious. They set out from New York by boat for Albany, thence by canal for a hundred and fifty miles to Buffalo. There they crossed Lake Erie to Toledo, and thence proceeded by stage coach to Vincennes.

As they were ignorant of the conditions of the country and language, Father Sorin deemed it wise to locate not too far from the episcopal city. After consultation with the Bishop he chose a small settlement twenty-seven miles north of Vincennes. Here some thirty-five families, chiefly of Irish and German nationality, had a little log-chapel built in honor of St. Peter. They did not understand French, and it became Father Sorin's first business to learn English. Intercourse with the scattered settlers being limited, he had to have recourse to a grammar and dictionary provided for him. It was not long before he ventured to preach in his newly acquired language. At the end of a year he writes: "They nearly all understand me". Meanwhile he is able to record a number of converts among the neighboring Protestant families. They understood little of his eloquence in the pulpit; but they saw that the lives of these men were those of true disciples of Christ. Indeed the apostolic zeal of the Brothers of the Cross could hardly remain hidden. For weeks they were obliged to sleep on planks in their small log-cabin, or under the open sky in the forest. There was no prospect of the land yielding them crops of any kind for at least some months and the provisions they could buy or beg in their poverty from the poor neighbors were of the most frugal sort.

To physical inconveniences were soon added others of a more trying kind. The Bishop deemed it part of his authority to prescribe for them methods that should make them independent of their religious superior in France. Any one familiar with the workings of a religious community will realize that the efficiency of its members depends largely on maintaining the spirit of the original foundation. This spirit is embodied in the constitutions and rules of the Order. In matters not only of internal government, but frequently also those that relate to missionary methods, to the undertaking of educational projects or to special works of charity, the principle that a religious is bound to every kind of good work and under all circumstances does not apply when measured merely by the

exigency of diocesan needs or the judgment of the Ordinary. There was no serious friction, however, nor any disagreement that could have been interpreted as a lack of loyalty and priestly submission on the part of Father Sorin. What he wanted was schools; that was the chief purpose of the missionary enterprise for which the Brothers of the Cross were instituted. Eventually they meant to have a college where the training of youth would lay the foundation for later moral leadership in a people that was still largely ruled by political adventurers on the one hand and by religious enthusiasts on the other. Father Sorin looked far into the future, and seeing that, unless the present opportunities were seized, the spiritual harvest of generations to come would be at the mercy of those who were prepared to sow cockle in God's field, he made his purpose plain to the Bishop.

Providence favored Father Sorin's plans. The mission at South Bend which had been the scene of Father Badin's zeal, had, since his death some years before, been practically abandoned. Father Deseille had succeeded the aged priest for some years; then followed Father Petit, who died almost before he had established his residence there. These were saintly priests and they left among the orphaned people the longing to have some one to dwell among them who would definitely continue the work of instructing their children. For a time there seemed no one to answer their call. Then the Bishop, who had a title to the land which Father Badin had wisely bought in view of the growing colonization throughout the State, made over the site to the Religious of the Holy Cross. This was to secure the maintenance of the mission with a prospect of the improvement of both the spiritual conditions and the industrial and educational development of the district. The "Association of the Holy Cross" was to agree to establish a novitiate at South Bend, and, as soon as possible, a college for boys. These two institutions would, it was hoped, sustain each other and contribute to the growth of a native priesthood. It was a wise plan, and the results have more than justified Father Sorin's foresight and zeal.

After the terms of transfer had been arranged between the Bishop and Father Sorin, a small missionary party set out from St. Peter's, their first establishment near Vincennes, late

in November of 1842. They traveled in two divisions. One guided the ox-team that bore the effects of the community. The Brothers were not to return to the old mission, though some of the members had remained behind until their new home could be put in some sort of order. Five others, including Father Sorin, went by a more direct, but less travelled road. The distance before them was more than a hundred miles. On the first day they made little headway, covering only about five miles. The heavy snows which blocked the road and their inexperience in travelling during the intensely cold weather caused delays that had not been foreseen. But Father Sorin's men were a courageous and lively set; and after eleven days they safely reached South Bend, ahead of the teams.

The lake at the Bend was frozen over, and the scene, in its snowy robes, presented a charming spectacle. They were all delighted, although there was no comfortable dwelling place, but only a log cabin and enclosure. The Brothers at once set about constructing what they knew to be the foundation of their future home. Father Sorin wrote enthusiastically to France about the beauty of the site and their immediate prospects: "O, may this Eden ever be the home of innocence and virtue!" He gave to it the name of *Notre Dame du Lac*, and made a special consecration of the place and of his little community, with its hopes of increase, to the Blessed Mother of Christ. The mission was dedicated to St. Joseph, the name permanently given to the county. The eleven postulants who had remained at St. Peter's under the novice master, joined the community the following spring, when accommodation had been made for their reception. The character of the accommodations may be gleaned from the fact mentioned in one of Father Sorin's letters at this period. "We have at present but one bed, and they (the Brothers) insist that I shall take it. They themselves sleep on the floor, just as they did at St. Peter's. To-morrow I shall give up my room to brother Marie (Francis Xavier) to be used for his shop."

When Father Sorin had set out for America, the Superior and Founder of the Fathers of the Holy Cross conceived the design of founding a congregation of women who would be able to supplement the efforts of the institute by primary and secondary instruction for girls. This was of especial import-

ance on the missions in foreign parts where the care of young children demanded other than the Brothers' aid. As soon as it was feasible some of the members of this new order of Sisters of the Holy Cross were sent to Notre Dame. The first colony arrived in 1843.

The Sisters soon mastered the new situation, and as a result attracted the interest and affection of the people with whom they came in contact. Applicants to join the Order came from young girls in the neighborhood and the need of a local novitiate thus soon made itself felt. Father Sorin, who acted as spiritual director of the new community, promptly suggested to the superior at Le Mans as well as to the Bishop of Vincennes the desirability of making the Order of Sisters of the Holy Cross in America autonomous. A difficulty arose on the part of the Bishop, who some time earlier had induced the Sisters of Providence from France to settle in his diocese, and who feared that competition in what seemed to him a limited field for the higher education of women, might deprive both institutes of adequate support. He therefore refused his permission for a permanent settlement of the Sisters of the Holy Cross in his diocese.

Father Sorin, always perfectly submissive to legitimate authority, after vainly trying to convince the Bishop that there was ample room for the successful activity of both communities within the same jurisdiction, solved the difficulty by transferring the Sisters to the neighboring diocese. He selected a suitable site for a convent and school on the Michigan side of the Indiana-Michigan boundary line. Here the little village of Bertrand, not very far from Notre Dame, offered a convenient location, outside the jurisdiction of Bishop Hailelandière. The Bishop of Detroit, Mgr. Lefevre, had given his cordial approbation to the arrangement. The four sisters from Le Mans who had begun the foundation at Notre Dame, together with four American postulants, opened the new house in the summer of 1844. Father Sorin remained their spiritual director, and two years later went to France for the purpose of obtaining additional sisters to supply the growing educational needs of the district. Henceforth he acted as superior (or Provincial, as the nuns called him) of the institute.

Meanwhile the Brothers had gone on with their work. During the summer of 1843 they had erected a substantial community house which was to be the beginning of the new college. The following year (August, 1844) Father Sorin laid the cornerstone of what was to be the college building proper. He at once took the precaution of getting a legal title by having the institution chartered as a collegiate and manual training school. His further plans for the construction of a chapel and novitiate house were completed within the next ten years.

During the summer of 1854 the cholera broke out in the region, and death gathered its toll from the young community. "Priests, Brothers, Sisters followed one another to the grave so rapidly that it seemed none would be left. To avert panic among the students the dead were silently carried out at night." These were sad days for the strong heart of Father Sorin and his companions, Brothers and Sisters.

Among the latter was one who had but recently joined the community. She was a quite exceptional woman, Sister Mary of St. Angela. Amid the sudden calamity of the epidemic she gave an example of heroic qualities and ability to meet promptly the exigencies that arose from day to day not only among the religious but among the neighboring people. The nuns became nurses of the Holy Cross without any pretension to a special title or engagement—prompted only by the charity of Christ. They taught, watched with the sick, and directed measures to avert panic. A teacher, a brother, or a nun, might collapse quite suddenly and in a few hours would be found dead. For months it was impossible to foresee arrangements to be made for the management of the schools or the communities at Notre Dame and at Bertrand.

Father Sorin learned much and saw what was of value in the tact, intelligence and generosity of the men and women who, whilst they depended upon his guidance, caused him to look to them for assistance in return.

When the epidemic finally ceased, the surviving members of the two communities of the Holy Cross had undergone a new training which was to be of permanent value in the future exercise of their missionary labors.

Bishop Hailandière had resigned his see in 1847. The Eudist Fathers, brought over by him from France, had opened

an ecclesiastical seminary at Vincennes. They worked harmoniously side by side with the Brothers of the Holy Cross, and religion was making good progress in the diocese. Bishop Bazin, who had been appointed to succeed Mgr. Hailandière, lived but a few months after his consecration. The next ordinary was Monsignor Maurice de St. Palais, a frontier missionary who had seen something of the spirit of the Order of the Holy Cross in his meeting with the Brothers. He was glad enough to find the Sisters over whom Father Sorin exercised spiritual and temporal authority at Bertrand disposed to come back to Notre Dame, their original home in his diocese. Accordingly the mother-house of the community was removed to its present site at St. Mary's in the autumn of 1855. Two years later the American foundation was recognized as a separate institute, no longer dependent on the mother-house in France for subsidy or direction.

The work of both communities of the Holy Cross at Notre Dame went steadily on under Father Sorin's vigilant and active care. He soon found an efficient helper in his priestly ministry. Father Granger, who had recently arrived from France, was given charge of the novitiate and quickly became a general favorite with the young people. Father Elliott, the eminent Paulist and veteran missionary, entered Notre Dame College about this time as a young student. He has left us a graphic picture of the place and personnel of the period. "The novitiate building," he writes, "and locality formed the most conspicuous feature amid the great natural beauty of Notre Dame, placed as they were on an eminence between the lakes. It was to us a sort of Mount Thabor. There the elect children of God prayed." As a matter of fact it was here that Father Sorin had in the early days of his residence at Notre Dame habitually retired to work out the plans of the future development of the institute. Later on he had himself gradually cleared the place of the underbrush, and laid it out for the buildings of novitiate and chapel. To the students it became a sort of enclosed and charmed spot where only the Brothers really had a right to be; and they formed all kinds of mysterious notions, as Father Elliott tells us, of the ascetical practices that developed the sanctity which shone out of the countenances and actions of some of the religious. "I have since then had

a long experience of priestly and community life, and I have no recollection of men whose appearance and conversation were more edifying than these scholastics and novices. Associated with their religious demeanor was a certain air of perfect manliness, candor, and simplicity of character."

A notable period of changed activity came with the outbreak of the Civil War. The principles of personal freedom for which Abraham Lincoln stood in 1860 had been an inheritance of old in the Catholic Church, and Father Sorin found no difficulty in adjusting his moral views to the political duties that called for their defence. Withal it was not war but peace which he had come to preach; and in the ensuing struggle of the States, north against south, his religious and civic zeal found vent in the ministry of mercy to the wounded on the field of battle and in the hospitals. Reference has already been made to his promptly coming to the rescue of our government with a systematic and well trained organization of nurses constituting a hospital corps, which had received its first lessons in "Holy Cross work" during the cholera epidemic seven years before. Mother Angela's name looms large in the annals of this time, and her inspirer was Father Sorin.

At the end of the war the work of construction and expansion of the industrial and educational plant at Notre Dame went on at a rapid pace. The history of that development has been told elsewhere and is merely a further illustration of the genius, zeal in the cause of God for the advance of religious education, and the personal magnetism that secured continually trusty and capable helpmates to Father Sorin.

One of the first things he did after the conclusion of national peace was to establish a literary organ to carry into a wider sphere the work in honor of Our Blessed Lady done and fostered at Notre Dame. For this purpose he founded *The Ave Maria*, which has these many years prospered under the wise management of Father Daniel E. Hudson. Here too Mother Angela aided during the pioneer days by her capable pen the magazine which was to bring joy and edification to thousands of Catholic homes in America and other English-speaking lands; and which is, we venture to say, the one periodical in the English-speaking world that has gathered as in a casquet for presentation to Our Lady all the names of Catholic authors

that have honored by their writing the name of Mary, Queen of Heaven, during the last half century.

In 1868, at a canonical election of the Society of the Holy Cross, Father Sorin was made Superior General of the Order. This office he retained until his death.

All went well for another decade, and the influence of Notre Dame as an educational centre, unique in its religious character and in its efficiency to promote the industrial and civic welfare of the Middle States, was being felt and recognized on all sides, when, in 1879, a great conflagration swept away the work of nearly forty years of unceasing toil and personal sacrifice. The entire group of edifices, houses of study, service buildings, laboratories and libraries, was burnt to the ground. Father Sorin, now an old man of nearly seventy years, saw the fair fruits of his long and arduous labors turned into bleak disorder and ashes. Many a stout heart might have been broken by the dire stroke of misfortune; but the aged priest bent humbly under the shadow of the Divine Hand which he knew was ever ready to open in fresh blessing to those who trusted in Him. The aged pioneer lifted his head and heart, and began anew the work thus suddenly destroyed. God's blessed design soon appeared, for in the reconstruction Father Sorin was able to improve the old plans and to profit by the experience of the past in making his work more solidly durable and far-reaching.

What was needed was money. He was poorer now than ever before, because the number of those who depended on him, if the institute was to continue its work, was much larger than during the period in which the Society and its affiliations had been gradually extending their growth. There were times when he actually had no money in the treasury. But he trusted in Our Lady's help; and she did not disappoint him. Many incidents are recorded in the history of the institute to prove the seemingly miraculous way in which the venerable priest found himself unexpectedly lifted out of straits from which at first sight there appeared no possible relief. One day, when sadly embarrassed for funds, Father Sorin found a man on his grounds who offered himself to the community as a laborer. He had come from California, a miner weary of wandering. The vagrant was told that he could not be given wages, but if

he were willing to enter as postulant and become a Brother he was welcome. The man accepted, and when shortly afterward he heard some one speak of the financial difficulties under which Father Sorin was just then laboring, he said: "There is a bit of gold down in my trunk which I brought with me from California; if the Father wants it, he is welcome to it". The bit of gold proved to be nuggets worth four thousand dollars, and Father Sorin accepted it as a God-send. It also pleased the miner, who became an efficient member of the community—Brother Augustine, the college baker for many years.

Similar instances of how God rewarded the trust of His venerable servant Father Sorin repeat themselves throughout the subsequent history of Notre Dame, during which the work of reconstruction was going on. He and those who followed him had left all—their father's house and their country; and God, in return, bestowed upon them the hundredfold even in this life. When in 1888 the venerable founder celebrated his golden jubilee in the priesthood, the government of his native country, France, though it had banished religion from its own schools, recognized the influence of the hero of the Cross abroad, by conferring upon him the title of Officer of Public Instruction. It seemed to be his native country's seal of recognition to the worth of what he had done for his adopted land as citizen and educator. In reality it was the testimony to his priestly zeal which belonged to a country beyond the stars that claimed a wider citizenship than earthly patriotism could ever satisfy. His love of fatherland was supernatural as well as natural. His allegiance was to the King of Kings, under the banner of the Holy Cross, adorned with the queenly lily of the Mother of Christ. His warfare was against sin and the ignorance which largely begets sin; and his conquests were all for souls redeemed by the Precious Blood of Jesus.

From the day of his fiftieth anniversary as a soldier of the Holy Cross he withdrew from the ranks. He wanted to lay down his sword at the foot of the altar of the Virgin Queen whose signature was on his épaulettes. But the men who had witnessed his valor in the days gone by would not have him removed from the place of honor on the rolls. The sound of his name would be like a bugle-call so long as he was still living

among them. If he did not actually fight in the battle front, they knew him to be in the King's tent. Those near him would bind the wounds from which he was now suffering, and which he had concealed in the midst of the soldier's advance. For five years he endured, gently, patiently the continuous dressing of these bleeding marks of valor. It was the final preparation of the old warrior for the meeting of His Sovereign King who would fasten for ever the badge of victory upon his breast. He died on the eve of All Saints' Day, 1893. His monument of Notre Dame University was fitly decorated on the occasion of the recent Diamond Jubilee—not only by the loyal sons of the Holy Cross and by many of those whom the Alma Mater of *Notre Dame du Lac* has nourished at her breast, but by the Father of Christendom, Benedict XV, who sent the following congratulatory letter to the Very Reverend Rector and the co-laborers of the University:

AUTOGRAPH LETTER OF HIS HOLINESS BENEDICT XV

*To Our Dearly Beloved Son, the Very Rev. John Cavanaugh, C.S.C.,
President of the University of Notre Dame.*

BENEDICT XV

Health and Benediction.

Excellence commands the unbidden esteem and sympathy of men. Nevertheless, he who has informed Us of the celebration of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Notre Dame has been emphatic in praising and extolling both the achievements of your University and the distinguished services of your religious family. It is, indeed, to the labors of the Congregation of Holy Cross that the birth and growth of this splendid institution are due, an institution which has given to Church and State so many sons eminently schooled in religion and learning. How gratifying this is to Us need hardly be expressed. In the midst of the trials of the present hour which press upon Us so heavily, the brightest ray of hope for the future lies in the special care that is being bestowed upon the education of youth. In this age when young men, to Our great sorrow, are so drawn to evil by the allurements of vice and the insidious teachings of error, it is, above all, by training youth to virtue that the life of nations is to be fashioned and directed in righteousness and truth.

Your own personal merits, and those of your Congregation and University, have achieved the universal recognition of bishops, clergy and laity. It is through their coöperation that the resources of this

noble home of learning have been increased, that the number of its students, drawn from all parts of the world, has steadily grown, and its educational influence become ever greater and more far-reaching. In view of all this, We congratulate them and exhort them to persevere in their generous encouragement and support of this godly work.

To you, dearly beloved Son, to your Brethren in religion, to all the Professors and students of Notre Dame University, as a token of heavenly blessings and as a proof of Our affection, We lovingly grant in the Lord the Apostolic Benediction.

Given at Rome, in St. Peter's, the thirtieth day of April, nineteen hundred and seventeen, the third year of Our Pontificate.

BENEDICT XV.

LETTER FROM CARDINAL GASPARRI, SECRETARY OF STATE.

*Secretariate of State
of His Holiness.*

*The Vatican,
3 May, 1917.*

Very Reverend Father :

I am fulfilling a very pleasant task in transmitting to your Reverence the precious autograph letter which the August Pontiff has vouchsafed to write to you on the occasion of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of the foundation of Notre Dame University.

I seize the present opportunity to extend to you my best wishes on this memorable occasion and to assure you of my sincerest esteem.

I am, Very Reverend Father,

Yours very sincerely in Xto.,

PETER Card. GASPARRI.

The Very Rev. John Cavanaugh, C.S.C.,
President of the University of Notre Dame,
Indiana.

THE MATTER COVERED BY THE PRIEST'S INTENTION AT MASS.

SOMETIMES unfortunately, even during the most solemn moments of Holy Mass, secular thoughts intrude themselves into the priest's mind, and, it may be without any fault of his, distract his attention for some time. Moreover, even though his mind is not occupied with idle or profane objects, the very fact that all his attention is concentrated on the Sacrifice which he is offering, may possibly be the occasion of his not adverting at the Consecration to anything but the prin-

cial¹ matter present, namely the wine and the large host; and may lead him to overlook the secondary matter, namely, small hosts that may be needed for the Communion of the people. So it is of some importance to try to ascertain how far inadvertence to the presence of small particles that are in a ciborium, or are otherwise on the altar, interferes with the validity of their consecration. Accordingly, I propose to consider this question, but rather with a view to explaining the practical conclusion the priest must adopt in such cases and the practical rule he is to follow, than for the purpose of determining what is theoretically or speculatively the better opinion.

Now, in the first place, it is well to observe that the want of attention or advertence is prejudicial to the consecration of any matter that it is possible to consecrate, only in so far as it interferes with the priest's intention. The question then to be answered is, How far does inadvertence neutralize, or do away with, or altogether prevent the presence of, the proper intention? A priest has an actual intention of consecrating if he adverts to what he is doing at the Consecration. If he does not advert to it, his intention is at the most only virtual; and unless this is, as it were, energized by some acts that accrue from it, it is liable in the course of time to lose its efficacy and become merely habitual, which is quite insufficient in the minister. It appears, accordingly, that a purpose of consecrating the essential matter at Mass may survive a period of abstraction which would be quite fatal to an independent intention covering secondary matter; inasmuch as the former would be kept up by the different acts of the priest in preparation for Mass, and by the function itself up to the time of the Consecration. It must be remembered, too, that, besides being prejudiced by a period of inadvertence, the necessary intention may become nugatory owing to an expressed or implied condition of its efficacy not being fulfilled. The condition that is most frequently suggested in this connexion is that the particles be on the corporal.

I shall first consider the cases where the priest's intention may be held to become inoperative because the requirements of the rubric just mentioned have not been complied with;

¹ For using this terminology I have the authority of Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Moral.*, II, n. 168 (11th Ed.).

and afterward, the cases where it is doubtful if the particles were ever embraced in the intention.

1. The first case then occurs where in the words of Lehmkuhl ² the priest *jam consecraturus* adverts to the presence of a ciborium or loose particles ³ which are not already on the corporal, which he does not bring on it, and which he at once forgets. Lehmkuhl does not specify the exact moment denoted by the term *jam consecraturus*, but it is certainly applicable to the time at which the priest says "Qui pridie" and perhaps earlier. In these circumstances the short interval between advertence and the Consecration cannot interfere with the requisite intention, and the only danger to its validity comes from the non-fulfilment of a possible condition in the priest's mind that the matter should be present in the prescribed manner, that is, on the corporal. This danger, however, is rated by Lehmkuhl, in common with many others, as of little or no importance; for he holds it to be perfectly certain ("certissime") ⁴ that the particles in question are really consecrated.

There are, however, or perhaps it would be more correct to say were, many theologians of eminence who do not share his confidence. Thus St. Alphonsus ⁵ says it is the more common and more probable opinion, held by Suarez, Croix, and others, that a ciborium, left through forgetfulness outside the corporal, is not consecrated, because, seeing that to have an intention covering matter that is not on the corporal is a mortal sin, no one can be presumed to have such. The Saint admits, however, that the opposite opinion is not improbable. At the same time his rejection of it is quite decided and does not make any allowance for advertence even at the stage when the priest is *jam consecraturus*. So it is difficult to see how Lehmkuhl's view can be acted on in practice, though on the merits of the question the bulk of modern theologians are on his side. For the sin involved in the hypothesis of a valid consecration is at the most material, and they do not admit the argument that the priest only wishes his intention to be effective when even an objective violation of the rubrics is

² *Ibidem*.

³ What I say of a ciborium throughout the article applies to these also.

⁴ *Ibidem*.

⁵ *Theologia Moralís*, De Eucharistia, n. 217.

avoided. To admit the lawfulness of such an intention in celebrating Mass or conferring a Sacrament would, they maintain, often jeopardize the validity of these sacred actions. Thus, if the corporal were quite soiled without the priest detecting this, or if it were not blessed, or if he did not know that the chalice was unconsecrated, or if, say at a baptism, the water were very impure, the minister's intention would be quite nugatory—a series of objective irreverences that would seem effectually to dispose of the doctrine of a conditional intention.

It is true, indeed, that some of the patrons of it try to discriminate between an intention covering secondary matter and that which covers what is primary, or which is concerned with the valid administration of a Sacrament; holding that in the first case to have everything in accordance with the rubrics may be supposed to be a predominant intention of the minister, while in the latter cases it is his purpose, even at the risk of permitting material sin, to consecrate validly or confer the Sacrament validly.

However this may be, if the view of these authorities were correct, the manifestly inadmissible conclusion would follow, as Ballerini⁶ remarks, that even when a priest has an actual intention and full advertence to what he is doing, his act is not valid if, unknown to him, there be something seriously against the rubrics, but not affecting validity, connected with the matter on which his intention falls. Nay more, it would follow (a view to which very few nowadays would subscribe) that if a priest forgot to uncover the ciborium it would not be consecrated. It is true indeed that one is bound to do this under pain of only venial sin. But if a person may be presumed to have a predominant intention not to commit a serious material sin, why should it not be assumed also that he is unwilling to commit a venial one?

Theoretically then it may be taken that, unless a priest has definitely made up his mind to the contrary, it is his intention to consecrate the secondary matter on the altar quite unconditionally; at least unless it is removed a considerable distance from the corporal, or is in a receptacle quite unsuitable for a

⁶ *Opus Theologicum Morale*, IV, De Eucharistia, n. 60.

consecrated host, such as an ordinary box.⁷ But the weight of authority requiring for validity the presence of the ciborium on the corporal makes it difficult to understand how Lehmkuhl can say his view is perfectly certain. The case, however, contemplated by him does not often arise, for if the priest *jam consecraturus* is in a state of advertence, this would be very unlikely to have disappeared at the moment of Consecration; just as it is unlikely that, adverting to the matter, he would not advert to the obligation of there and then placing it on the corporal.

2. The next case to be considered occurs when the ciborium is not on the corporal and the priest does not advert to its presence on the altar at the *offertory or later*, though he has done so at an earlier stage of the Mass. In these circumstances it is only doubtfully consecrated, for the condition assumed—but, as I have tried to show, unwarrantably—by many to be part of the priest's intention is not verified.

3. There is far less reason for thinking that the secondary matter is consecrated if, though on the altar, it is not on the corporal, and the priest does not advert to it at all during the Mass. For in this case no matter how desirous he may have been before Mass to have Holy Communion for the ordinary faithful, or for the sick, we cannot assume that such a state of mind involves an intention to consecrate at all hazards, as it were. His anxiety merely involves a firm purpose of taking the steps prescribed by the rubrics as a condition of, or a necessary preliminary to, forming the intention of consecrating. I see a great difference between this case and the last one I mentioned where the priest adverts to the ciborium during Mass; because in the latter case it may well be held that his intention is final and unconditional, whereas it may not be taken for granted that this is his state of mind before Mass. It is true indeed that Noldin⁸ says that a priest has the requisite intention "*qui ante sacrum monetur de ciborio in Missa consecrando et annuit, etsi postea ad illud non advertat; eo ipso enim, quod de consecratione monitus annuit,*

⁷ If a particle were under the corporal, it would not be consecrated at all, partly as being outside the priest's intention, and partly because the word "*Hoc*" would not apply to it. Lacroix, *Theol. Mor.*, De Sacramentis, lib. VI, n. 442.

⁸ *De Sacramentis*, n. 113.

intentionem elicit consecrandi particulas in ara ponendas." And Ballerini⁹ says: "Haec intentio, suggerente ministro, *ante Missam* habita, dummodo virtualiter perseveret, sufficiens dicenda est pro valida consecratione illius materiae".

But, notwithstanding what these authorities say, Lehmkuhl's¹⁰ view is the only one that can be followed in practice. It is that "materia superaddita actione ab ipsa liturgica actione distincta assumi et determinari debet, idque ut omne dubium removeatur intra Missam vel externa vel saltem interna actione."

I come now to the cases where there is no question of the priest's intention being endangered by the non-fulfilment of any condition, on which it may be held more or less plausibly to depend, but where there is reason to doubt whether the matter in question ever came within the ambit of his intention.

1. It is possible, for instance, that a second particle is, unknown to the priest, actually in his hands at the moment of consecration. This may happen by two large hosts having, owing to dampness or other cause, become joined together. And in such circumstances everyone admits¹¹ that the entire matter is certainly consecrated, even though part of it has not come under the priest's notice at the consecration or at all. Because his intention is directed to, and covers the actual matter in his hands, unless in the purely imaginary hypothesis that he makes some deliberate restriction. Thus Busenbaum, quoted by St. Alphonsus without comment, says: ¹² "Unde si sacerdos advertat post consecrationem esse duas [hostias] simul junctas, utramque ut consecratam sumet ut habet missale. Si vero ante consecrationem, postquam obtulit, advertat, alteram seponet, et post Missam ipse, vel alius sumat, tanquam panem benedictum." The words of the Missal referred to are: "Si sacerdos putans se tenere unam Hostiam, post consecrationem invenerit fuisse duas simul junctas in sumptione sumat simul utramque." ¹³

⁹ *Op. cit.*, n. 62.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, note to n. 168.

¹¹ If the second particle in the case be a small one, though it is Lehmkuhl's own opinion that it is consecrated, he says this is merely probable. *Casus*, II, n. 126.

¹² *Theol. Moral.*, de Eucharistia, n. 216.

¹³ *De Defectibus* &c. VII. 2.

2. The next difficulty to be considered arises when the priest, though having forgotten the secondary matter at the consecration, though of this at the Offertory or some time later, and as a consequence *brought it on the corporal*. In this case all the theologians say the particles are certainly consecrated and may, without any uneasiness, be distributed among the people. For the facts satisfy the requirements even of those who support the theory of the conditional intention. A result that Lehmkuhl thinks is achieved also, if the priest thought, though erroneously, that he had brought the matter on the corporal. Because, he says,¹⁴ advertence and intention at the Offertory remove all doubt, especially "Si tunc temporis eas (hostias) assumpsit atque in corporali super sacrum lapidem se eas collocare putavit."

3. If the priest at the beginning of Mass himself places the ciborium *on the corporal*, or if during the Mass he sees anybody else do so, there is no doubt as to its consecration, no matter how completely it subsequently escaped his attention. For as Noldin says:¹⁵ "Intentionem autem consecrandi expresse elicere censetur quivis sacerdos, qui vel ipse particulas defert ad aram, ut eas postea consecret, vel qui intra Missam advertens ciborium consecrandum poni in ara hoc consecrare proponit." And the intention being present, no condition stands in the way of its efficacy, if, as I assume, the particles are on the corporal; nor has the intention time before the consecration to become merely habitual. This last contingency would be altogether excluded, if it be held that the intention of consecrating secondary matter is not, as it were, independent even before the consecration, but that from the beginning it merges in the general intention of celebrating Mass; for this, of course, is energized by the different actions that precede the Consecration. As Ballerini says:¹⁶ "Haec intentio, si virtualiter permanet et influit respectu materiae principalis ita ut non alia intentio requiratur, manebit quoque et influit respectu alterius quae cum ea ad modum unius accepta est."

4. Another case in which it may be doubted if the matter comes within the scope of the priest's intention at all, is where

¹⁴ *Theol. Moral.*, n. 168, sec. 2.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, n. 62.

a particle is placed on the paten by the sacristan (say for the Communion of the server) before Mass or even during Mass, without the priest being told of this or having realized it. Accordingly, if he were short-sighted, it may easily happen that it would escape his notice at the offertory and the consecration, although on the corporal, and he may become aware of it for the first time when the Confiteor is being said.

In these circumstances I think personally that it is more probable that the secondary matter has not been consecrated. Many, however, seem to think that much is to be said for the opposite opinion; on the ground apparently that, though there has been at no time an explicit intention covering the matter in question, there has been an implicit one, embodied in the liturgical actions and words directed to the entire matter on the corporal, and that it is possible to consecrate;¹⁷ or, as others¹⁸ argue, because it is in conformity with the mind of the Church that the priest's intention should be so comprehensive, he may be presumed to have formed it on these lines.

From what I have said the following general rules for the guidance of the priest may be deduced. (1) If the matter is not on the corporal, at the best (failing some special and predominant intention in its regard) its consecration is doubtful. (2) Even though it be on the corporal, its consecration is no more than doubtful, if the intention and action of the priest concerning it have taken place altogether outside Mass.

The next question to be answered regards the disposal of doubtfully consecrated matter. Well, the priest cannot in any circumstances distribute it to the people, of course. And there are two practical methods open to him. One is to put the particles in question in the tabernacle and to consecrate them or have them consecrated, conditionally, at the next Mass celebrated on the same altar. And another plan, which is the one recommended by Saint Alphonsus, is not to reserve them at all, but to consume them after the chalice; or better still—so as to avoid all danger of breaking the fast before its entire contents have been taken—after the first ablution. Of course the first method is the better, if the number of particles doubtfully consecrated be considerable.

¹⁷ Lehmkuhl, *op. cit.*, n. 186, 4 (*circa finem*).

¹⁸ *Apud St. Alphonsum, op. cit.*, n. 216.

If through some mistake the priest had two hosts on the paten at the Offertory, and having detected this before the Consecration, decided not to consecrate one of them, this should be put aside, and as "*panis benedictus*" be taken after Mass by the priest himself, rather than by another who may not understand the circumstances.¹⁹

Another question of some importance is whether the minute fragments that are on the corporal or in the ciborium, separated from the complete hosts, and the drops separated from the body of the wine, are covered by the priest's intention. Very probably, apart from its being specially determined to this effect, they are not; because, to consecrate them would not be in harmony with the mind of the Church, for in the case of the minute fragments they would not be available for Communion, and in both cases there would be a certain danger of irreverence. This danger would be very marked if drops on the outside of the chalice were consecrated; and so it is certain they are not. While, of course, it is not necessary, as a condition of valid consecration, that the bread and the wine should be present in such quantity as to be actually seen, still detached portions of them that are so minute as to be beyond the range of ordinary human vision are not only excluded from the priest's intention, but could not be covered by the word "*Hoc*" of the form.

However this may be, it is of importance for the priest to form a positive intention of never consecrating any mere tiny fragments of particles *unless they are adhering to a host*, or isolated drops of wine.²⁰ He need not of course make up his mind to this effect every time he says Mass. If the intention be once formed and renewed occasionally, it will be operative in each Mass in virtue of his general intention of consecrating "*juxta ritum sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae*".

The danger apprehended by some, that by restricting his intention in regard to the drops of wine the priest may break the fast by consuming them before the Most Precious Blood, is without foundation, for they would hardly be swallowed separ-

¹⁹ See St. Alphonsus, *ibidem*.

²⁰ Some while advocating this in case of the wine or of fragments on the paten or corporal, object to it as applied to the ciborium, on the ground that in this last case there is no danger of irreverence through the fragments being lost. Lacroix, *de Sacramentis*, lib. VI, n. 449.

ately from it; and in any case, as Lacroix says:²¹ “magis praecavendam esse irreverentiam Sacramenti quam laesionem jejunii”. Similarly, the priest need have no feeling of uneasiness that, by excluding mere fragments from his intention, he may be endangering the consecration of portions of particles large enough to be distributed to communicants in case of necessity. And any incongruity in having unconsecrated fragments or drops in such close proximity to what has been consecrated, is more than offset by the advantages of the procedure in question.

In conclusion, it may be well to say a word on a subject whose interest is largely of a speculative character. It is the possibility of consecrating particles that are mixed with those already consecrated. The difficulty of this is twofold, (1) because the priest cannot concentrate his intention on anything definite and determined; and (2) because there is no object that is definitely and individually denoted by the word “Hoc”, so far as *human knowledge* goes. Lugo, accordingly, holds that it is not possible to have a valid consecration in such circumstances, unless *all* the hosts be consecrated *sub conditione*.

But as against his view there is good reason for holding that the Church recognizes this possibility in the case of unconsecrated wine, united with what has been already consecrated. For it authorizes²² a priest who has to say Mass on the same day in two different churches, after having exhausted the chalice at his first Mass, to put it in the tabernacle or in some appropriate or secure receptacle, and use it or have it used when Mass is next celebrated in that church. Now it is certain that some drops of the Most Precious Blood will remain in the chalice in such circumstances; and it is the more probable opinion that these do not lose their consecration on being united with wine. So it follows as a consequence that the presence of the Most Precious Blood does not interfere with the consecration of the wine with which it is united. And if consecration is possible in this case, why not in the case of the particles?

DAVID BARRY.

Limerick, Ireland.

²¹ *Apud* Ballerini, *ibidem*, n. 57.

²² De Herdt, *Sacrae Liturgiae Praxis*, I, n. 284. The rubrics for Christmas Day are clearly to the same effect.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

A LETTER came to me a short time ago written in the hand of a correspondent in the Island of St. Thomas, bearing a United States stamp. At first I thought it had been mailed in the United States. Then the truth dawned upon me that I must never expect to see again the old familiar Danish stamp upon letters from the Virgin Islands, as they have passed from the power of Denmark forever, and they are now the property of the United States of America.

How strange it seems! The old Dannebrog flag, that had been waving over St. Thomas for a period of 251 years, has been lowered at last. The white cross has come down, and the white stars have gone up.

Fifty years ago, when the writer was a child, a treaty was concluded by which St. Thomas was to be purchased by the United States. Many inhabitants of the island favored it; we wore the United States colors to signify our satisfaction, the writer having as principal reason that he was of American parentage. The treaty, however, was not ratified. The terrible hurricane and earthquake of 1867 came to throw a damper on the proceedings, and we heard no more of the purchase. The United States bought Alaska instead. The Danish fort, old Fort Christian, saluted the national colors and the affair was at an end.

To-day the purchase has passed into history and the Virgin Islands, St. Thomas and St. Johns, with the numerous uninhabited islets that surround them, together with Santa Cruz, belong to us.

It is a long time since Christopher Columbus first caught sight of these islands. It was in 1493, on his second voyage to America. He was sailing northward from Dominica, where he first saw the Caribs, and as he went, hardly ever out of sight of land, he gave the names of saints and sacred places to the islands that he passed. Monserrat, Antigua, St. Christopher's, St. Eustachius, St. Martin followed, until the island of the Holy Cross, Santa Cruz, was reached. Here the Spaniards had an encounter with the fierce Caribs, and hence they proceeded to Borinquen to which the name of St. Johns was to be given, and which, in course of time, would be better

known as Porto Rico. On their way, the Spaniards passed a numerous group of islands, some of them mere rocks. The image of St. Ursula and her many virgins came to mind, and the group was collectively named the Virgin Islands, the two largest becoming known as St. Thomas and St. Johns.

For a long time, the Spaniards were so occupied with Santo Domingo, Jamaica, Cuba, and Porto Rico, that they cared little for the smaller islands. Other nations, however, did not fail to grasp their opportunity, and at an early period we find the English, French, and Dutch busy in the work of colonization of the Windward and Leeward Islands.

The Dutch and the English appear to have settled in Santa Cruz or St. Croix, as this island is also called, about 1625. The early settlement of St. Thomas is wrapped in obscurity. The visitor to the island, as he enters the harbor of the town of Charlotte Amalia, the only one in St. Thomas, will observe three towers, two on the hills and one on the fort near the sea. These are respectively known as Blue Beard's, Black Beard's, and Red Beard's tower. By whom were they erected? They have been attributed to the Buccaneers by some; by others to the Dutch; but their origin seems a mystery. Blue Beard's tower is surrounded by a kind of fort with mounted cannon.

Light begins to dawn with the advent of the Danes. On the 11 March, 1671, there was formed in Copenhagen the West India and Guinea Company, and in the same year the Danes took possession of St. Thomas as uninhabited. The English governor of the Leeward Islands protested, but King Charles II of England directed his representatives in the West Indies not to interfere with the Danes. It appears from certain records that they had come to St. Thomas as early as 1666, before the establishment of the West India Company, and it is not unlikely that they, instead of the Dutch and Buccaneers, erected the towers to which allusion has been made. Thus did Denmark come into possession of St. Thomas, whence Danish colonization spread over the Virgin group and the Island of Santa Cruz.

From an agricultural standpoint, Santa Cruz grew to be the most important of the Danish islands. It is also the largest. There was comparatively little agriculture in St. Thomas, which is entirely mountainous, if you except the narrow strip

of land through which Main Street runs, along the bay, with the level spaces beyond Cocanut Square. But, if St. Thomas won little fame in agriculture, and if, for a long time, it was hardly known to the American public, except for the Bay rum that bears its name, on the other hand it gained great renown as a commercial and maritime centre, though this glory too has departed. Until about fifty years ago, St. Thomas was, perhaps, the busiest island in the West Indies, as far as trade is concerned; but it was a trade quite transitory in its nature. St. Thomas had little or nothing to export, but it served as a centre, a depot for trade with other islands and with the Spanish Main, or Venezuela and Colombia. I can well remember how in the late 'sixties and early 'seventies, St. Thomas was overrun with buyers, mostly from Spanish America, with which she carried on a large wholesale business in goods imported from the various countries of Europe. There was no restriction on commerce, as free trade prevailed and import and export duties were hardly known. As far as I know, the revenues of the islands proceeded from taxes and licenses, while the Danish administration weighed lightly upon them. Few complaints were heard, and whatever disturbances arose were mostly among the turbulent negroes of Santa Cruz, and were of an economic nature.

Denmark was among the first of the nations of Europe to join in the anti-slavery movement, and she emancipated her slaves early in the nineteenth century. But slavery left behind an immense negro element in all the islands. To provide for labor, Santa Cruz adopted a contract system which was another form of slavery and which no doubt exerted an influence on the several negro rebellions that the island has known. After the emancipation of the negroes in the Dutch Islands in 1863, large numbers emigrated to Santa Cruz, allured by the change and the wages promised, but, no doubt, to find themselves disappointed.

In the meantime, little St. Johns, isolated from the world, continued its idyllic and monotonous existence, cultivating such fruits as home consumption needed or its neighbors might be willing to purchase.

With the emancipation, the plantations in St. Thomas declined, and the whole attention of the island was devoted to

commerce. For the trades and the necessary manual labor generally, on land and water, the blacks of the island sufficed. Hence St. Thomas has never employed coolies, like the British and Dutch colonies, nor Chinese, except in very limited numbers.

The island, nevertheless, soon assumed a very cosmopolitan character, and people from every clime visited its shores, while foreign tongues were constantly heard. As headquarters for the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company, St. Thomas saw travellers to the West Indies and South America constantly coming and going. With the steamers of the English, French, and Spanish lines repeatedly visiting her harbor, St. Thomas became a very important coaling station, as well for merchant steamers as for the many men-of-war of European and American nations that were frequently touching at the island. In those days sailing vessels were numerous, and the harbor was generally filled with them. I can well remember, moreover, the many side-wheel or paddle steamers that were then crossing the Atlantic. The first time I went to Europe, in 1871, it was in the old Royal Mail steam packet "Seine," a ship of some 3,000 tons, propelled by side wheels. Soon after that screws became more numerous, and the old side-wheelers disappeared, though I recollect meeting the U. S. man-of-war "Powhattan," a side-wheeler, as late as 1882 off the harbor of Santa Cruz.

I think that St. Thomas reached the climax of its prosperity in the late 'fifties, although it held its own quite well for ten years more. The greatest blow was received by the hurricane of 1867, followed about a month later by an awful earthquake and tidal wave. What the gale had spared, the earthquake destroyed. The former had played most havoc with the wooden houses, the latter sought out for its victims those built of stone. The loss of life in the hurricane was much greater than in the earthquake, especially among the shipping in the harbor. It was about this period, just after the Civil War, that the first negotiations had been set on foot between the United States and Denmark, looking toward a transfer of the islands.

The next blow that St. Thomas received was the removal of the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company to Barbados, where-

by St. Thomas fell to be a very secondary port, especially since the Company began to run steamers to the Isthmus and to Colombia and Venezuela, thus destroying the trade of the Spanish Main that St. Thomas had enjoyed. Nor was this compensated for by the fact that the German Lloyd steamers began now to touch at the island.

At the period of its greatest prosperity St. Thomas was not particularly noted for health. Besides those diseases endemic in the tropics, it had occasional visits of small-pox and cholera, while yellow fever was hardly ever absent from its shores. With the advance of tropical hygiene, it stands to reason that St. Thomas has been benefited, like other countries in which yellow fever was once prevalent. It is now quite rare to hear of an epidemic of yellow fever anywhere.

Leaving aside such evils as these, the climate of St. Thomas is not disagreeable, while the winter months are cool. The elevation of the hills affords most desirable sites for beautiful residences, commanding some of the most superb views that mortal eye can desire. If the moral tone of the place can be raised, with the improvements, hygienic and other, that Americans would introduce, there is no reason why St. Thomas should not be an earthly paradise.

Speaking of the yellow fever reminds me that the United States once lost in St. Thomas a distinguished citizen by that terrible disease. I refer to Admiral Palmer, a fine gentleman of the old school who had fought in the Civil War. He was a man, as I heard, of deep religious sentiment. During the earthquake, in 1867, he lay with his flagship, the "Susquehanna," in the harbor of St. Thomas, where she suffered some damage from the tidal wave, while the "Monongahela" at St. Croix was raised on the crest of the wave, and landed high and dry on the shore. Those were the days of our grand old steam frigates that used both sail and steam. How trim they looked, those fine full-rigged ships, as with yards squared they rode at anchor in the bay. The generation that knew and loved them is fast passing away.

To return to the admiral. Whether he was taken ill on board the ship or ashore, I do not remember, but I recollect that he died in the house of an American friend, a Mr. Swift. I still see the house on the hillside, basking in the beautiful

tropical light, and a junior officer seated on the broad steps leading up to it, who smilingly replied to my inquiries regarding the admiral's health.

The language most widely used in the Virgin Islands is English. Danish always remained the official language; but as the Danish population is small, and the majority of the inhabitants stand more or less related to the British islands, English naturally prevails. This is also true of the Dutch, but not of the French and Spanish islands.

Owing to its cosmopolitan character, and to a large population from the French and Spanish islands, one often hears French and Spanish spoken in St. Thomas. Some of the negroes use a jargon of their own, which seems to include Dutch elements and may be related to the Negro-English of Swinam, or the Papimento of Curaçoa.

During the whole of the Danish occupation, the Lutheran was the established and official religion of the island. At one time at an early period Catholicity must have been proscribed. Nevertheless it finally found its way to the island. The other churches in my day were the English or Anglican, the Dutch or Dutch Reformed, and the Moravian, which had a strong following among the blacks.

The Catholic Church of St. Peter and Paul, the only one in St. Thomas for a long time, was always designated as the French Church. It is located in that part of the town, "Down Street", where the bulk of the French and Spanish population is located. The other portion of the town, "Up Street", is mainly English. A chapel was built there some few years before I left the island. In the former church the sermons are delivered in French and in English.

St. Thomas belongs to the diocese of Roseau, in the Island of Dominica, and to the ecclesiastical province of Trinidad. In the early days of their Catholicity secular priests ministered to the Catholics of St. Thomas and Santa Cruz. In the latter place there are two cities at opposite ends of the Island, Frederiksted and Christiansted, or West End and Basin, each having its church.

About the year 1857 an awful schism was created among the Catholics of St. Thomas, and the schismatics took possession of the church, obliging the pastor, the Abbé Orsini, to hold

services in a private house. The good priest, who had much persecution to endure, finally retired to the Island of Trinidad, where he lived many years and died with the title of Monsignor.

As a result of these troubles, the Redemptorist Fathers were called to the mission of St. Thomas. The first one, Father Dold, had to assume a disguise, so intense were the feelings of the disaffected elements. He took up his abode in the house of one of the principal "Varinqueurs", as the schismatics styled themselves, and, after some time, had won so many friends that he finally threw off the disguise and announced that he was a priest. Such was the ascendancy he had gained and the esteem he had won that the leaders offered him the parish, which of course he at once accepted. The adventures of Father Dold in the West Indies and South America, written by himself in a very fascinating style, are preserved in manuscript in the archives of the Redemptorist Province of Baltimore. They read like a romance. One day, when the good Father was preaching, the writer of this article, then about three years of age, distinguished himself by walking up the aisle and singing "*Dominus vobiscum*".

The Redemptorists of the Belgian Province have remained in St. Thomas up to the present time, and hence have spread to Santa Cruz, Dominica, Antigua, and St. Kitts. The present Bishop of Roseau, the Right Rev. Philip Schelfaut, a fellow student of the writer at Wittem in Holland, is a Redemptorist. We had another fellow student, who is His Eminence Cardinal van Rossum, a member of the Dutch Province. Both the Belgian and Dutch Provinces have produced some very distinguished men. To the former belonged that great disciple of St. Clement Hofbauer, Father Amandus Passerat, whose canonization is spoken of, and the illustrious writer Cardinal Victor August Deschamps, Archbishop of Malines, and predecessor of Cardinal Mercier. One of the best known Redemptorists in St. Thomas was Father de Buggenoms, at one time, I believe, appointed Bishop in Santo Domingo, though he never took possession of his See, or perhaps resigned. After leaving St. Thomas, Father de Buggenoms spent much of his later life in the archiepiscopal palace of Malines, in company with Cardinal Deschamps.

The Dutch Province gave to the Church the Rev. Bernard Hafkenscheid, one of the first, after Bishop Frobin Janson, to hold systematic missions in the United States. I believe he was at one time stationed with the Paulist Fathers at old St. Joseph's in New York.

Another illustrious member of the Dutch Province was that humble son of St. Alphonsus, the Venerable Peter Douders, whom the writer knew well in Dutch Guiana, and the cause of whose canonization is advanced. He was the Damien of Guiana, the Apostle of the lepers.

It was in St. Thomas that the writer first met the Very Rev. Henry Schaap, then Provincial of the Dutch Redemptorists and later Bishop of Hetalonia and Vicar Apostolic of Surinam. Some of the dearest memories of his life are linked to this distinguished Redemptorist and to his companion, Father Van Ryckevorsel. With these the writer went to Holland, and they made his education for the priesthood possible; hence he remembers these benefactors with undying gratitude, and with certain pride he recalls to mind that among his predecessors in the See of Hetalonia, linked to the name of the illustrious Ullathorne, later Bishop of Birmingham, he finds that of John Henry Schaap.

Many and arduous have been the labors of the Redemptorists in the West Indies, and notably in the Virgin Islands. They have had a constant struggle against unbelief, ignorance, and immorality; but they have kept steadily on their way, in spite of many difficulties, not the least being the poverty of their missions. Of late some of the West Indian islands, and among them Dominica and St. Thomas, have been visited by a disastrous hurricane that has increased the distress of the Bishop of Roseau and of his co-laborers.

A new era has now dawned for the islands, that must henceforth be known as "The Virgin Islands of the United States". They have been purchased from Denmark for the sum of twenty-five million dollars. On Saturday, 31 March, the old Dannebrog flag, the red with the white cross of Denmark, went up for the last time. Toward four in the afternoon, a guard of honor from the Danish man-of-war, "Valkyrien", under Lieutenant Jorgensen lined off on the pier. Another position was occupied by the Americans under Lieutenant Leach.

Shortly after, in presence of many officials and of the officers of the "Valkyrien" and of the American ship "Hancock," Commander Pollock met the Danish Governor, Konow, and the articles of transfer were read and signed. Then Governor Konow ordered the flag lowered. It came down at 4.45 P. M. mid the tears of the assembled multitude, the salute of twenty-one guns from the ships and the battery, and the playing of the Danish national anthem by the band from the "Valkyrien." Again the ships and battery thundered out their salute of twenty-one guns, and, while the band of the "Olympia" rendered the "Star-spangled Banner," "Old Glory" floated up to the top of the pole, and the Virgin Islands had passed from Denmark to the United States. After the flag raising, Bishop E. C. Greider of the Moravian Church offered up a prayer and the benediction was pronounced by Bishop Charles B. Colmore, the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Porto Rico. The churches represented by their clergy were the Lutheran, the Moravian, the Reformed Church, the Wesleyan Methodist, and the Catholic. The last named was represented by the Rev. Father Moris, C.S.S.R., Superior of the Redemptorists. The Colonial Council had sent a farewell cable to Christian X, King of Denmark, to which the chairman received this reply: "Express my heartfelt thanks for kind telegram. God bless you all and best wishes for the prosperity of your islands."

John N. Lightbown in his "Mail Notes," published in St. Thomas, writes: "It was a long time coming—this change—America's first effort at acquisition being made just fifty years ago, but it has come at last. For weal or for woe we are within the folds of 'Old Glory'—and we do trust that the islands may enjoy that 'happy and prosperous future' which both the King who has ceded them and the people of the United States who have acquired them hope for. We are taken under the Stars and Stripes, not as a conquered people, and neither do we expect to be treated as such. We have for these many years enjoyed the rights of a free and enlightened people, and of this freedom we expect no curtailment whatever. We shall give our loyalty unstintedly to the flag that now floats over us. From this moment on it is our flag and in every respect we

demand every privilege, all the rights, and all the protection that it stands for."

St. Thomas has often been visited by distinguished personages, and not seldom has it given refuge to political exiles from various parts of Spanish America, such as Mexico, Venezuela, and Santo Domingo. Prince Alfred of England, the "Sailor-prince"; Prince Waldemar of Denmark, a queen of the Hawaiians, then better known as the Sandwich Islands; De Lesseps of Panama Canal fame, and others have visited its shores. I have a recollection of reading somewhere that centuries ago it had also been visited by the great Dominican, St. Louis Bertrand.

In the nineteenth century, it was for some time the home of that turbulent Mexican spirit, the famous General Santa Ana who was a well known character in the island, and who lived in a beautiful house on one of the hills. It has harbored ex-presidents and ex-governors from Venezuela and Santo Domingo, among them being the ex-priest and ex-president Morales of the latter country. Although Morales had left the ministry, he never in any way, so far as I know, showed himself hostile to the Church. Santo Domingo has also had other priests as president, such as the late Archbishop, and Monseigneur Nouel, the present Archbishop, who was recently Apostolic Delegate for Cuba and Porto Rico. As of especial interest to Americans we may also mention the fact that our Alexander Hamilton, a native of the island of Nevis, spent a portion of his boyhood in Santa Cruz. Gertrude Atherton in *The Conqueror* gives a fine description of a West Indian hurricane which she supposes Hamilton to have witnessed in Santa Cruz.

With the change of government there will, no doubt, be a great influx of Americans to the islands and the Virgin group will become better known.

CHARLES WARREN CURRIER,
Bishop of Hetalonia.

ABBE BREUIL AND THE CAVE MEN ARTISTS.

THERE has been a very surprising—one might well say almost astounding—development of science intimately concerning man, during the last few years, which comparatively few even of educated people have realized. A good many of the publications with regard to it came shortly before the war and unfortunately the war has so occupied men's minds all over the civilized world that almost nothing else has had any proper chance for consideration. Besides blockades of various kinds, the high cost of living and the high prices of many things have prevented the diffusion of the literature of the subject. Shortly after the war, however, I feel sure that this will prove one of the most startlingly revolutionary scientific developments that have come to us for many generations, if not indeed for many centuries. It consists of what we have learned with regard to the earliest ancestor of man in Europe, that is, the dweller in caves, whose mode of life and something even of his mode of thought have been brought home to us by the wonderful discoveries made in the Dordogne in Western France, as well as in Northern Spain and in certain parts of the South of France.

Now it is extremely interesting to find that the two men to whom we owe by far the greatest part of our knowledge of these cave men—Abbé Breuil and Father Hugo Obermaier—are both priests; the one a Frenchman, and the other a German. The story of what they have done in adding to our knowledge of man's existence in Europe is one of the romances of modern science. Nothing has been a greater shock to preconceived notions than the discovery that so far from the ordinary accepted view of the cave-dweller of the olden time being true, it is separated *toto coelo* from realities. Instead of having been only a bit higher than the animals, this earliest man we know by his remains was as a matter of fact an artist and in every sense of the word as highly developed a human being as we are ourselves.

His cave homes were discovered to be decorated with beautiful pictures and figures of animals and occasionally of men and women as well as of the natural objects that surrounded the cave man in his life. These pictures are not crude and

childish, though they are primitive; but then the primitives in art have come back into favor and critical appreciation so strikingly in recent years that it is much easier to understand than it was a generation ago that primitive painting may be great painting, and there is now universal agreement on the part of the artists and critics that the cave man did great painting. A distinguished artist said not long since that there is no animal painter alive to-day who can paint animals more vividly, more true to the life, more artistically in any genuine sense of that term, than the cave-man artist.

The artist is the flower of our civilization such as it is, and we are quite willing to acknowledge that a man who is capable of seeing the beautiful things of the world around him and reproducing them so as to give pleasure to others is a leader among men. He may be the son of a little pioneer farmer who secures his first colors from the Indians dwelling near him, whose portraits he makes, as our own Benjamin West did; or he may be brought up in a stone mason's family as Michelangelo was and learn his first use of the chisel and mallet for the crudest mechanical purposes; or he may be the son of peasant farmers who remains a peasant at heart and never gets out of sympathy—thank God!—with his peasant relatives, like François Millet, the great French artist of the end of the nineteenth century. But whatever he is and no matter what his education or refinement, we look upon the genuine artist as much more than an ordinary man, as one of the highly gifted beings of his generation. Now there is no doubt at all that the cave man was, or at least the artists of his time were, just such superior individuals. Before he was a carpenter and built himself houses, before he was a farmer and planted seeds instead of gathering the natural produce of the woods, before he was a tailor and fashioned his garments to fit his body, merely dressing himself in the skins of the beasts that he hunted, *man was an artist, a lover of the beautiful, a decorator of his home, a man among men for all time.*

Is it any wonder that this new appreciation of the earliest ancestor of man that we know anything about is considered to be the most revolutionary development in modern science. Just consider for a moment how different are the realities from the theories that had been woven for us and that had

been so widely and frequently published that practically everybody was inclined to think that they must represent quite serious scientific truth. The cave man had been pictured to us as the first stage in the evolution of human beings from the beasts. Some large-sized monkey who had acquired the habit of walking on his hind legs, developed cunning enough to displace the other wild animals from their lairs in the caves of the hillside and thus begin domestic life and an upward career toward civilization. He was a little better able, because of his recently achieved cunning, to care for himself and his family than were the other beasts; but he was at best a very pitiable object. His wife, doubtless a conquest of his club, he had probably dragged home to his cave by the hair of her head to keep her there in the most absolute subjection and drudgery in order that she might be the mother and caretaker of his children. Popularizers of science are still telling us stories of the cave man quite as if they were truths and not fables. The very same people would laugh at the myths of savages (though so many of those myths contain a kernel of marvelous beauty), but they are quite unconscious that they are myth-making and that their myths are quite sordid and unworthy of humanity's striving.

Above all, we have heard a great deal about the cave man and how far humanity has advanced since his day. He was supposed to be ready to quarrel on the slightest provocation and to be always in readiness to get the other man first so that he might not get him. Of course it was clear on these assumptions that the cave man was quite without the ethics which characterize civilized man and which are so confidently asserted to be the gradual development of man's recognition, as his evolution progresses, of his duties toward other men. We have a nice long name for it in our time adopted and adapted from the Greek, so as to make a very simple old-fashioned idea appear important and novel. We call it altruism. Of course the cave man is supposed to have none of it. He was merely selfish, as the animals are; for all that the animals think of is themselves and those separated parts of themselves, their offspring. The cave man was a slightly better beast.

Now we have changed all that, as the French say; at least we ought to proceed to change it at once, for the archeologists

have shown us very clearly that the cave man was just a man like ourselves, only, if anything, somewhat more cultured in his interests. For his devotion to art and the beautiful things round him, and his desire to reproduce the living things of nature round him, in which he rejoiced so much that, even in the winter time when the weather made the chase impossible and on rainy days when confined at home, he wanted to see them on the walls of his cave, stamp him as a superior being.

We owe most of our knowledge of this new set of ideas, founded on actual observation with regard to the cave man, above all to two great scientists, both of whom, as I have said, are priests. In the divided state of feeling that separates cultured humanity at the present time, superinduced by a war that contradicts so strikingly the ideal progress of which we hear so much, it is of more than passing interest to find that one of these is a Frenchman, a representative as it were of the Allies, Abbé Breuil, and the other a Bavarian, quite as sincerely representative of the Central Powers, Father Hugo Obermaier. When shall we be able to have such co-ordination and coöperation in the great scientific work after the war once more?

Manifestly this revolution in our knowledge of man deserves to be well known, above all by those who have maintained a conservative attitude in their philosophic opinions as to the origin of man and have waited patiently for anthropology to develop properly, though they were being pushed into premature opinions by so many supposedly authoritative scientists who were urging the most radical notions. Brother priests all over the world should surely know the facts, for not only do they represent one of the greatest triumphs of science in our day, but they confirm traditional opinions that for so long were looked upon as hopelessly backward. Not that it is unusual for priests to be distinguished in science. On the contrary, a knowledge of the world of a half-a-dozen modern priests would give one an encyclopedic knowledge of modern scientific advance. Abbot Mendel, Father Secchi, Father Wasmann are names that make this very clear, and now we must add two more to them—Abbé Breuil and Father Obermaier, who, while following faithfully priestly and ecclesiastical duties, have given the world such ripe fruits of their scientific research.

ABBÉ BREUIL AND HIS WORK.

Abbé Breuil was born 28 February, 1877, at Mortain, in the Manche, of a family many of whose members of preceding generations had belonged to the magistracy of Picardy. From his very early years he manifested a marked taste for natural history, and above all took up quite seriously of his own volition the study of entomology, to which he later did distinct services by collecting the subterranean fauna of the caverns as also of the Spanish territories surrounding the habitations of the cave men.

His college studies were made in the Collège Libre of St. Vincent at Senlis. He entered the Seminary of St. Sulpice of Paris in 1895 at the age of eighteen. Abbé Guibert noticed very soon his liking for the sciences and gave him special opportunities and recommended that he direct his attention toward archeology and the earliest records of human existence. Abbé Guibert was himself the author of a volume on origins (*Des Origines*), which concerns itself, however, mainly with apologetic problems.

During his vacations Abbé Breuil had the opportunity to associate himself with some of the distinguished men who were doing the best work in archeology in Paris at that time. He came to know and receive the directions of such men as Capitan d'Ault-du-Mesnil, Salomon Reinach, Boule Gaudry, and these associations gave a strong impetus to the interest in archeology which had been aroused by Abbé Guibert. Above all, young Breuil had the magnificent advantage of becoming the intimate friend of Edouard Piette, that great searcher of the Pyrenees caverns, who exercised a very special influence over him and indeed adopted him as a student and disciple. Their intimate relations to one another until the death of M. Piette in 1905 directed Abbé Breuil's work, particularly in the line of the artistic archeology of the caverns and to the study of what is known as superior paleolithics, because it concerns itself with art objects rather than merely with the remains of the crafts of the olden time.

Abbé Breuil's first scientific publications began in 1898, when he published an article on the chronological status of the Bronze Age. After 1901 all his attention was devoted to the Old Stone Age and especially to the higher art and industry

of that time. He was ordained at St. Sulpice in December, 1900, but remained at Paris for the next five years studying for his degrees in science and taking special courses at the Catholic Institute. From 1905 to 1909 he was a Privat-docent at the University of Fribourg in Switzerland. His special subjects were Prehistory and Ethnography.

Since 1901 about one-half of Abbé Breuil's time has been occupied with the actual investigation of caverns, alone and with Capitan and other well known archeologists. A large number of caverns adorned with designs or paintings have been found, the reproduction of which and the description of their surroundings as well as the deciphering of their meaning have fallen upon Abbé Breuil almost alone. Cartailhac called Breuil to collaborate with him in the caverns which were found in the French Pyrenees and together they discovered a number of others in the same region. In 1902, with Cartailhac, Abbé Breuil was invited to take up the study of the celebrated cavern of Altamira in Spain. In 1906 he returned to Spain to pursue new researches in other caverns of the Cantabrian Province with Alcalde del Rio, their discoverer. During the following years he was very much occupied with the paintings discovered in large numbers after systematic search of caverns in Aragon, Catalonia, Estremadura, Castile, and Andalusia.

In 1909 he was asked by the Prince of Monaco to take a post in the foundation created by that liberal patron of the sciences, the Institute of Human Paleontology. Most of his best work since then has been published under the patronage and at the expense of the Prince.

To him more than anyone else is owed the recognition of the significance and the importance of the Aurignacian level or horizon in cave-man archeology, a period which preceded the Solutreen and followed the Mousterien. He worked out the application of the idea of a certain development of style in the engraved figures on the various objects picked up in the cave. He pointed out a certain development from the reproduction of the natural image by the engraver to a schematization of the mode of ornament in the moveable paleolithic art. For the first artists saw things for themselves and reproduced them simply as they saw them. John Ruskin once said that this was the hardest thing in the world to do. Then

their successors after several generations refused to follow the difficult path of personal observation, but they looked through the eyes of those who had seen before them, imitated their pictures, took short cuts to get the results, schematized, and of course art degenerated. This is what men have always done; so far from being surprising that some of the cave men should have done it, the surprise would have been if they had not done it. We know in our time how tempting it is for men to take such short cuts and then think, because they are getting more or less the same results, that they are doing just as good work as their predecessors, though their work is really trivial, cheap copying and easy imitation.

Abbé Breuil's work has been very widely recognized and highly complimented. While he has occupied himself almost exclusively with the scientific aspects of paleolithic archeology, a great many other names are much better known because they have devoted themselves to the vulgarization of the newly acquired information. Vulgarization seems a very good word to employ, though we call it popularization in English; for there is an innuendo in the other word that deserves to be recognized. Practically all the authoritative writers on the subject, however, Dechelette in his *Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique*, Salomon Reinach in his classic works, and many others, have expressly outlined their obligations to him, and Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn in his *Men of the Old Stone Age* dedicated that book to "Emile Cartailhac, Henri Breuil, and Hugo Obermaier, his distinguished guides through the upper paleolithic caverns of the Pyrenees, the Dordogne and the Cantabrian Mountains of Spain". He confesses that his main reliance has been upon the work of Abbé Breuil and Father Obermaier, and his book is full of references to their published books and articles.

Abbé Breuil has published much in the journals—*L'Anthropologie*, *La Revue Archéologique*, *La Revue de l'Anthropologie*, as well as in the volumes issued under the patronage of the Prince of Monaco. Much of the material, however, that he has gathered from the caverns is still unpublished. Besides, a good deal of work has appeared in collaboration with others. At the International Congress of Archeology, held at Monaco in 1906 and Geneva in 1912 to discuss the whole

subject of the archeology of the cave man, his industries, his arts and crafts, his colored paintings, his moveable and parietal art, Abbé Breuil was considered by all those present as by far the best informed man on the whole circle of departments of knowledge that have gathered round the subject of this earliest ancestor of man in Europe. He has not only visited practically all of the caves, but he has also studied the collections in the various countries of Europe, not only in France, Switzerland, and Spain, but also in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, and even Russia. No wonder then that he is looked upon as an authority on the subject and that a comprehensive view of the significance of the life of this earliest ancestor of man in Europe is now readily available to all who want to replace the ridiculous theories foisted upon us by over confident evolutionists, by actual information derived from the direct observation of their remains.

THE CAVES AND CAVE DWELLERS.

These cave dwellings must not be thought of as shallow holes in the rocks of the mountains, or even as deeper cavities caused by the loosening of a boulder and its fall. The caves in which the cave men dwelt are much more like our famous caverns of Kentucky, the best known of which is the Mammoth Cave, though none of the European caverns can be compared for variety or extent with our American wonder of the world. Many of the caverns, however, penetrate the rock for a quarter of a mile or a half a mile and even farther. They were the product of the same sort of water activity as produced the caverns of Kentucky, and of course, while the Mammoth Cave is so well known that most people are inclined to think of it as unique, actually a great many caves exist in the State. So it was in the Dordogne and in certain parts of North Spain and in Southern France, where these cave dwellings have been found.

There was plenty of room in them and some of the living-rooms must have been at a considerable distance from the entrance. Indeed not a few of the pictures are many hundreds of feet from the entrance of the caves. This makes it easier to understand how they were preserved and are now comparatively so fresh and vivid for the study of our time. This,

however, makes it only the more difficult to understand how the painting came to be done.

Almost needless to say, at this distance from the entrance the caverns are utterly dark. There is no question of seeing one's hand in front of one's face. How then did the cave men come to make their pictures under such conditions? What sort of light did they employ? Sir Arthur Evans does not hesitate to say that the mystery of the illumination of these caves is astounding. There is no trace of smoke on the wall or ceiling, and yet we may be quite sure that any extensive use of the primitive modes of lighting by torches or oil lamps, such as the making of the pictures would require, could scarcely have been secured without leaving its traces. It is even more surprising to think that in this pitch darkness men should have cared to take the trouble and the time and exercise the patience needed to make their pictures. The difficulties increase the more we know about the circumstances of the cave man's life.

DISCOVERY OF THE MURAL PAINTINGS.

The story of the discovery of these mural pictures in the caves is an interesting little romance by itself. A distinguished Spanish archeologist was some twenty-five years ago engaged in looking for bone and horn remains and other objects that might be of interest in the debris on the floor of one of the cave dwellings at Altamira near Santander in Spain. For company he had taken his little girl, aged about ten, with him into the cave, and as she got used to the darkness and the light of the torch she ran here and there at play for herself. After a time, however, she went to her father declaring that there were pictures on the walls and asking him to come and look at them. He refused to be disturbed in his investigation of the floor of the cave and when she insisted concluded that she had been seeing her own shadow on the wall or some other shadows which deceived her with the idea that there were pictures. After a time however she succeeded in persuading him to look carefully for himself and sure enough he found the colored pictures that she described. Some of the most beautiful mural paintings of cave-man art have been found in this particular cavern, and the little girl as the real

discoverer has found a very definite place in the history of archeology.

When this discovery was announced, it attracted very little attention. First the story was not believed at all. Cave men might scratch rather interesting outlines of animals on horn and bone, but it was too much to ask the world to believe that they had *painted* pictures on the walls of their cave homes. It was concluded that these were either non-existent, the report of them being due to a heated imagination or desire for a sensation, or that they were modern sophistications. It was not until similar wall paintings had been found in caves at other places in Spain and at a number of places in France, so that there are more than a score of caves now known to contain them, that the mural art of the cave man became a definitely accepted department of archeology.

The whole story would remind one very much of what was happening just about this same time with regard to brain anatomy, in Spain. A young man, Ramon y Cajal by name, the first who had ever applied a microscope at a Spanish University, discovered in the later 'eighties the endings of the neurons in the brain, a discovery which revolutionized our knowledge of brain anatomy and made it very clear that cells and not fibres were the all-important elements of the brain. When this discovery was first announced it was received with utter incredulity. Biologists refused to believe that anything so good as that could come out of Spain. Some of the best biological journals in the world refused to publish Ramon y Cajal's articles, and when finally *La Cellule*, printed at the University of Louvain, published them, the discoveries announced were received with a great deal of scepticism. It was not until Ramon y Cajal went in person to the International Medical Congress held in Berlin in 1891 and exhibited his specimens that, led by such men as Virchow and Koelliker, to whom the specimens had been demonstrated, the biological world accepted Ramon y Cajal's work. In 1900 he was given the prize of the city of Paris by the International Medical Congress and later received the Nobel Prize.

Just as Ramon y Cajal's work was destined to be extended and amplified by others, so the Spanish discovery of cave man mural art fell into other hands for its development; and

above all, the Abbé Breuil, himself an artist, took up the accumulation of information with regard to it and the working out of its significance for the life of the men and women who created it and for whose delectation manifestly it had been made a part of their homes. Fortunately the Prince of Monaco, who is so nobly using the income that accrues from that dubious source of revenue, the Casino at Monte Carlo, in the extension of scientific knowledge, became nearly as much interested in this subterranean science as he is in suboceanic observations, and devoted nearly as much money to archeology as to oceanography. As a consequence Abbé Breuil has been able to publish some magnificent volumes containing copies in the exact colors of the originals of literally hundreds of these mural paintings as well as other illustrations of the art of the cave men.

Distinguished archeologists and scientists of other departments interested also in the antiquity of man have turned not only to Abbé Breuil's books but also to him personally in order to secure first-hand knowledge of these magnificent contributions to modern science. I have had the good fortune to talk with several Americans who met Abbé Breuil in the course of their own special studies on the subject of the cave men, and all are agreed in talking of him as a very charming man, a thoroughly sincere scientist, a very hard worker, a careful accurate observer—in a word, a thoroughgoing example of the virtues that a scientist must have if his work is to secure a permanent place in his favorite science. Abbé Breuil is tireless in his explorations, faithful in his reproductions, deeply interested in the diffusion of knowledge with regard to his subject, yet constantly ready to share his knowledge with others and willing to take almost endless trouble in order that foreign scientists may have the opportunities they desire to study the cave man under as favorable circumstances as possible.

I have been told too by those who met him of his faithfulness as a clergyman and his recognition of his priestly duties as the most important part of life. Even when on his exploring expeditions he makes it a particular point to arrange if possible to say Mass every morning, and if there are country folk in the neighborhood (for the caves are often situated at a great distance from the towns and even villages) he offers

them the opportunity to attend his Mass. Sunday he devotes entirely to his priestly duties among the poor folk of the neighborhood, and his kindliness and zeal win over even men who have been long away from their religious duties. The fact that he should be the head of a scientific expedition of this kind gives him great prestige among the country folk and he uses this in order to influence them for their own good as regards the reawakening of their faith and above all the taking up again of their religious duties.

He is himself almost scrupulously exact with regard to little things relating to his religious duties, as a well known professor of archeology of one of our great universities in this country, Professor MacCurdy of Yale, told me smilingly. The Professor had spent some time with him one summer. Abbé Breuil says his Mass each morning, giving Holy Communion to the country folk who may come if they are so minded, and then dons the khaki of his explorer's uniform and proceeds to spend the day in a cave. He comes home at night quite thoroughly tired and hungry, but he is not willing to sit down to his evening meal until he has doffed his khaki and reassumed his cassock so that he may be once more the ecclesiastic. He does this even though at times it would seem to be an over meticulous regard for ecclesiastical regulations and a following of rule from which it would seem that under the circumstances he might dispense himself. He never seemed to think so.

The interesting fact to me when the story was told to me was that, though it was told smilingly, there was evidently a deep-seated feeling of respect and reverence for the man who took his sacred obligations so seriously that he would not dispense himself from them even in such slight matters as might easily be passed over without scrupulous regard. And this is the man to whom modern science owes one of the most remarkable phases of its recent development.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York City.



Analecta.

ACTA BENEDIOTI PP. XV.

I.

AD R. P. D. TITUM TROCCHI, ARCHIEPISCOPUM TITULAREM LACEDEMONIENSEM, DELEGATUM APOSTOLICUM CUBANUM ET PORTORICENSEM: QUAE IN PRIMO CONVENTU ANTISTITUM CUBANORUM DECRETA SUNT, PRAESERTIM CIRCA SEMINARIUM CLERICORUM, LAUDAT ET COMMENDAT.

Venerabilis frater, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.— A venerabili fratre Nostro Sacrae Congregationis Consistorialis a Secretis relatum Nobis fuit de primo conventu annuo ab Antistitibus Cubanis, sub finem superioris anni, te Praeside, celebrato. Tu quidem, venerabilis frater, qui rei totius testis ac moderator aderas, de egregia Episcoporum voluntate amplissime enarrasti; quam ob rem et Nos minime ambigimus congratulationem Nostram et laudem eis ultro tribuere ac profiteri. Nihil enim ipsi habuisse prae oculis videntur, nihil discernendum censuisse, nisi quod et Dei gloriae et animarum utilitatibus et catholicae religionis inter suos profectui apprime conferret. Faxit Deus ut egregiae Pastorum voluntati uberrimi respondeant in gregibus fructus. Nos autem, quum cetera probamus, tum maxime quae de Seminario erigendo riteque moderando sapienter statuisti, statutaque ut naviter exequamini impense commendamus. Nisi etenim sacer clerus numero atque in primis merito augeatur; aut operarii deerunt qui in

messem Domini mittantur; aut impares reperientur divino operi exercendo.

Spes autem et frequentis cleri et sacerdotum, qui apte ac strenue in Christi vinea laborent, tota est in sacro Seminario, ubi adolescentium animi ad sancta rite formentur, tum scientiarum studio, tum maxime exercitio virtutum. Quae omnia ut pro optatis cedant, tibi et universis Cubanis Episcopis apostolicam benedictionem, divinarum gratiarum auspicem et benevolentiae Nostrae testem, amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, die XXI aprilis MCMXVII, Pontificatus Nostri anno tertio.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

II.

AD R. P. IOANNEM CAVANAUGH, E. CONGREGATIONE SANCTAE CRUCIS, MODERATOREM STUDIORUM UNIVERSITATIS A NOSTRA DOMINA NUNCUPATAE, EXEUNTE ANNO SEPTUAGESIMO QUINTO A CONDITA EADEM UNIVERSITATE.

Dilecte fili, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.—Habet hoc virtus ut opinionem ac benevolentiam, nullo intercessore, conciliet. Sed is, qui nuntium Nobis attulit sollemnium, quae apparantur, elapso anno septuagesimo quinto a condita ista studiorum Universitate, ita huius laudes laudibus intexuit religiosae familiae tuae, ut ad Nostram et opinionem et benevolentiam vix quicquam possit accedere. Initia enim atque incrementa praeclari huius operis fructus esse dixit laborum vestrorum; vobisque hoc in primis nomine habendam esse gratiam, quod concreditos adolescentes ita diligenter excolitis pietate ac doctrina, ut Ecclesiae ac civitati viros comparetis apprime utiles. Quam gratum id Nobis acciderit, vix attinet dicere. In hisce enim rerum asperitatibus, quarum aegre iam impetum sustinemus, haud licet meliora prospicere, nisi praecipua quadam cura adolescens complectatur aetas. Huius enim praesertim moribus vita in melius flecti fingique potest populorum; eidemque Nos nimium quantum metuimus cum a tot vitiorum illecebris, tum etiam a tam late manantibus doctrinarum venenis.

Quandoquidem vero tua tuorumque sodalium in Athenaeum istud ita extant et constant merita, ut sua in iis sit pars Epis-

copis et clero, sua ceteris ex America catholicis, quorum studiis et auctae sunt Athenaei opes, et frequentissimi acciti undique auditores, et uberrime impertita rectae institutionis beneficia, gratulamur utrisque, eosque hortantes, ut in sententia ac liberalitate perseverent, tibi dilecte fili, tuis religiosis sodalibus atque omnibus praenobilis istius doctrinarum domicilii doctoribus atque alumni, caelestium auspicem munerum Nostraeque testem caritatis, apostolicam benedictionem peramanter in Domino largimur.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, die XXX aprilis MCMXVII, Pontificatus Nostri anno tertio.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

SACRA RITUUM CONGREGATIO.

I.

DE COMMEMORATIONE OMNIUM FIDELIUM DEFUNCTORUM.

Quo universi Cleri Populique fidelis in Commemoratione omnium fidelium defunctorum par et consors ferbeat pietas, atque coniuncta suffragia magis prosint animabus in Christo quiescentibus; itemque sacra Liturgia in Eucharistico sacrificio litando divinoque Officio persolvendo, uniformi ac solemni ritu in universa Ecclesia peragatur, Sanctissimus Dominus Noster Benedictus Papa XV, ex Sacrae Rituum Congregationis consulto, suprema auctoritate Sua, statuit ac decrevit: " Solemnem Commemorationem omnium fidelium defunctorum, ex Constitutione Apostolica *Incruentum Altaris*, die 10 augusti 1915 edita, ampliori privilegio trium Missarum de Requie auctam, Festis solemnioribus primariis ritus duplicis primae classis et Ecclesiae Universalis amodo esse aequiparandam, adeo ut omnia et singula Festa propria locorum, Ecclesiarum, Ordinum seu Congregationum aliorumque Institutorum particularium excludat, excepta tamen Dominica, quae die secunda novembris occurrat; quo in casu eadem Commemoratio cum suis privilegiis in diem immediate sequentem de more transferatur. Sancivit insuper Sanctitas Sua, ut Kalendaria et Propria particularia, nullo excepto, huic Decreto conformari debeant. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque, etiam speciali mentione dignis.

" Die 28 februarii 1917."

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Pro-Praefectus.

II.

DUBIA DE MISSIS IN COMMEMORATIONE OMNIUM FIDELIUM DEFUNCTORUM.

A Sacra Rituum Congregatione pro opportuna declaratione postulatum est: An ex tribus Missis de Requie in Commemoratione omnium fidelium defunctorum a Constitutione Apostolica diei 10 augusti 1915 permissis: I. Sacerdos unam vel duas tantum Missas celebrare queat, et II. in utroque casu quaenam Missae ex descriptis in decreto Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis *Urbis et Orbis* diei 11 augusti 1915 legendae sint, ac demum III. pro quibus eadem applicandae?

Et Sacra Rituum Congregatio, exquisito specialis Commissionis suffragio, omnibus perpensis, ita rescribendum censuit:

Ad I. *Affirmative* ad utrumque.

Ad II. Prima Missa ex supradescriptis semper legenda est; altera erit secunda.

Ad III. In utroque casu una Missa ad intentionem celebrantis, in secundo tamen casu, altera ex duabus Missis pro omnibus fidelibus defunctis applicanda est.

Atque ita rescripsit et declaravit de mandato Sanctissimi, die 28 februarii 1917.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. *Pro-Praefectus*.

ROMAN OURIA.

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

25 March, 1916: Monsignor Gilbert Vincent Bull of the Diocese of Nottingham, made Honorary Chaplain of the Pope (extra Urbem).

11 June, 1917: Monsignor William T. McGuirl, of the diocese of Brooklyn, made Privy Chamberlain supernumerary of the Pope.

23 May: Monsignor Joseph Medard Emard, Bishop of Valleyfield, made Assistant at the Pontifical Throne.

23 May: Monsignor John de la Croix Dorais, of the Diocese of Valleyfield, made Protonotary Apostolic *ad instar participantium*.

14 June: Mr. James Britten, of the Archdiocese of Westminster, made Commander (*con placā*) of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are :

LETTERS OF POPE BENEDICT XV: 1. to the Most Reverend Archbishop Trocchi, Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and Porto Rico, commending the decrees of the first convention of the Bishops of Cuba, especially those concerning theological seminaries;—2. to the Very Rev. John Cavanaugh, C.S.C., President of Notre Dame University, on the occasion of Notre Dame's diamond jubilee.

S. CONGREGATION OF RITES: 1. raises the Solemn Commemoration of All Soul's Day to the high rank of feasts of double rite of the first class;—2. answers some doubts about the three Masses to be said on All Souls' Day.

ROMAN CURIA gives official list of recent pontifical appointments.

THE NEW CODEX OF CANON LAW.

Qu. There are various rumors afloat as to the appearance and promulgation of the new Codex of Canon Law. How is one to know for certain when the new legislation will be in force, and how can an authoritative copy be secured?

Resp. Apparently there will be plenty of time and opportunity to learn the contents of the new Codex before it actually becomes law. Newspaper accounts of the recent presentation of the Codex to the Holy Father give as portion of the text of the Bull of presentation the following passage: " So that all may come to a knowledge of the regulations of the Code before they bind, We ordain that they do not come into effect until Pentecost day of next year, that is, 19 May, 1918 ". Meantime the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* has published the Code as an extra volume, and, no doubt, Catholic publishers and booksellers in the United States and elsewhere will be able to procure copies for those who wish to have them. THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW will, during the months that intervene between the publication of the Codex and Pentecost 1918, endeavor to satisfy the legitimate interest of its readers in all

that concerns the contents of the Code, its meaning, applicability, and other kindred matters.

THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF ON THE OFFICE OF PREACHING.

The *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* of 2 July contains the Encyclical Letter of Pope Benedict XV, "De Praedicatione Verbi Divini". In the same issue are given the Sacred Congregation of Consistory's "Normae pro Sacra Praedicatione", a series of directions to be observed by preachers in every diocese. We reserve the publication of the complete text of these important documents, and of a commentary on them, for a later issue of the REVIEW, in order the better to do justice to their proper interpretation and promulgation. These rules meet a growing complaint, heard in many quarters, about the more or less sensational and unworthy methods adopted here and there by preachers and missionaries who aim at popularizing the Word of God by following the "Billy Sunday" manner of attracting attention. It is well that the tendency to vulgarize the sanctuary and pulpit should be checked by the ecclesiastical authorities.

A CRITIC OF CANON SHEEHAN.

The June number of *Studies*, an Irish quarterly review, contains a paper by Mr. John D. Colclough, entitled "Canon Sheehan: A Reminiscence and an Appreciation". The writer introduces himself thus:

I believe that I have some title to be heard upon the subject of this article. I met Canon Sheehan for the first time about forty years ago. In the winter of 1872 or the spring of 1873 Patrick Augustine Sheehan entered Gayfield College, Donnybrook, Dublin—the Mayfield of his somewhat lugubrious first story, *Geoffrey Austin, Student*. At the time I was an assistant master there . . . with the Reverend Edward O'Donohoe of Brisbane as President—a good missionary priest, but wholly unqualified by nature and experience for the direction of a seminary. Father O'Donohoe bore no resemblance whatsoever, either in ideals or in temperament, to the old priest—president of "Mayfield" . . . his name in the story I have forgotten. I have forgotten even my own; for I am delineated—not to say caricatured—in the tale as the fanatical devotee of Cicero

and all his works and pomps. Certain and sundry portions of Cicero I *did* expound to young Sheehan, or, at any rate tried to expound.

Mr. Colclough then sketches the boy, whom he remembers to have been "different in his deportment from the other students", as "*inter corrupta multa ipse incorruptissimus*," remarkable for "his meekness, his undemonstrative piety, and his gentlemanly reserve, which never degenerated into morose aloofness". He continues:

But I never reached the illusion of imagining that Sheehan had upon him that blossom of promise which evolves into the ripe fruitage of a "world-famed author". This cant phrase formulates the discovery or the invention of hyper-enthusiastic admirers and un-critical critics . . . I regarded him merely as a youth of fine moral principle and of intellectual endowment decidedly above the average. As time went on he became of the students my favourite—even my especial friend. In truth I was so impressed by the excellence of his mental and moral character that at a banquet given at Gayfield to the students and their extern friends on St. Patrick's day, 1873, I proposed Sheehan's health, and predicted (an easy matter) his success in any career which he might adopt. . . . Sheehan left Gayfield toward the close of 1873. I met him only twice afterwards. Here I am confronted with a difficulty. How could Sheehan, a student of Gayfield in 1873, have been raised to the priesthood at Maynooth in 1875? I am not competent to furnish the solution of what is to me an enigma, set forth with such assurance in all the obituary notices of the late Canon. *Id judicaverint sapientiores.*

Perhaps Mr. Colclough's difficulty may be solved by realizing that he has got the wrong man for his hero. It is a case of mistaken identity. That Patrick Augustine Sheehan, the author of *My New Curate*, was in 1873 pursuing his theological studies quietly, though with distinguished success, as a student at Maynooth College is amply attested by documentary evidence, such as the College registers, personal letters, and the memories of contemporary fellow students. Possibly the Sheehan to whom Mr. Colclough, as master at Gayfield College, taught Cicero, and of whom he says that "he became of the students my favourite—even my especial friend", is the younger brother of the famous Canon, who attended Gayfield College

for some time. But then the latter's name is not Patrick Augustine. As Mr. Colclough confesses to a bad memory for names in this connexion, the error may be accounted for on that score. In passing, let me add here that Patrick Augustine Sheehan was not ordained at Maynooth, but in Cork Cathedral.

I am not so much concerned, however, with Mr. Colclough's "enigma" or his comment about Canon Sheehan's personality. His criticism of the Sheehan books is quite a different matter. Its value does not depend on "Reminiscence", although the conviction which the writer of the article expresses that *Geoffrey Austin* contains a "caricature" of himself, may very well lead the reader to suspect the neutrality of an "Appreciation" from the same source.

One might ask at the outset why the subject should be discussed just at this time, since the author of *My New Curate*, though widely known by his writings, is to most readers no more than an obscure country pastor who happened to make a name by a new style of novel in which various types of priests are pleasantly sketched. The answer may perhaps be found in the fact that Canon Sheehan's work is gradually being recognized as having had a much wider range than that covered by his purely literary activity. As a matter of fact his published writings were quite subordinate in the mind of its author; and if, incidentally, they gave him a celebrity which became actually world-wide, they do not hold, in any true sense, the secret of his influence among the people of Ireland. His influence was of a different nature, silent yet withal powerful and far-reaching—a fact which remains to be shown and appreciated when the true story of this remarkable Irish priest comes to be better known.

Most of us have been led to judge of Canon Sheehan from his novels. To a certain extent judgment formed thereon is correct; but it is neither complete nor entirely fair to his memory, whether as a pastor of souls, as a patriot, or even as a writer, since much of what came from his pen did not bear the signature which gave currency to his novels, his essays, and verses.

During his lifetime, and especially during the early period of his career as an author, Father Sheehan was severely criticized by his countrymen. His sincerity and judgment alike

were attacked, and much of what he wrote was distorted to justify these censures. Others who differed from him questioned his intellectual ability, as though it were merely a tyro's part to have written world-famous stories of Irish life. When his essays and reflections, such as *Parerga* and *Under the Cedars and the Stars*, confuted this disparagement, some critics found them to be void of originality and the true marks of genius. Of his personal life little could be said, because little was seen of him beyond the limits of his parish. This doubtless helped the spread of the rumor, during the last year of his protracted illness, that his mind was unbalanced. The miserable gossip had no more foundation than the fact that an unfortunate of the same name led a vagrant life in the South of Ireland, and that an Irish priest also of the same name from an English diocese was recuperating in an asylum in the same district.

Now that the priest author of Doneraile is dead, the voice of depreciation is silenced. If still an occasional echo of criticism is heard, it is mostly based on misconception rather than on ill will or the envy that pursues living merit.

What, then, does Mr. Colclough say in his "Appreciation"? In sum this: Canon Sheehan had no genius for the writing of stories. His novels lack wit—even humor. "Of wit Canon Sheehan's novels have scarcely a trace; but the gift of humor was not absolutely withheld" (p. 283). His canvas shows "no life-like figures, no new and original creations, except perhaps that of the model priest of the nineteenth century" (p. 279). That is a type, in the critic's view, which is least adapted to treatment in fiction, "owing to the very nature of his sacred character and office". Moreover, it is "an unnecessary type for portraiture upon the written page. . . . The world needed no *My New Curate* and no *The Blindness of Dr. Gray* for enlightenment as to his excellences and his limitations". To Mr. Colclough these two novels are "largely dogmatic, sermonic, prosy, prolix"; and he doubts "whether any of them could command a second perusal." Of the Canon's other books, *Parerga* and *Under the Cedars and the Stars*, Mr. Colclough asks:

What useful purpose, academic or other, do such books subserve? They are simply a display of their author's discursive and voracious reading, furnished forth wholesale for the edification of those readers who, unable themselves to form accurate judgments about men and things, are content to adopt as their own the judgments of other people. Such books are not mental tonics, but mental opiates.

We leave those who are familiar with these volumes from Canon Sheehan's pen to appraise the justice of Mr. Colclough's estimate. The bare fact that *My New Curate*, after having been read by over ten thousand priests as it appeared serially in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, ran into three editions within a single month of its publication in book form (December, 1899), and into seven more editions in the following year, whilst translations of it were being published in French, German, Italian, Spanish, Dutch, Hungarian, Slavonic and Russian (Ruthenian)—and this without press agency or log-rolling—would seem sufficiently to confute Mr. Colclough's criticism. A somewhat similar generous and universal welcome greeted *Luke Delmege* and *The Blindness of Doctor Gray*, on their issuance in book form by the Messrs. Longmans, Green & Company, one of the oldest and best known publishers of books in English. If the English-speaking countries of America (which discovered our author and wanted to go to Ireland to see him); if Australasia (which asked for the appointment of this otherwise so secluded priest as one of its bishops); if England (which through its chief literary organs, not excluding *Punch*, the sure appreciator of wit and humor, hailed and praised this story of a Catholic priest, and an unknown Irish priest at that); if these and other countries found so much to admire in the genius of the author of *My New Curate*, who shall dare to say that he lacked the genuine power of the novel-wright? Ireland too, by the sad and strange fatuity which often makes her turn against her better sons, and by that oversensitiveness that leads her at times to distort an honest critic's arguments, proved abundantly that the voice from hidden Doneraile was heard in every part of the Green Isle. And as for Mr. Colclough's belittling of *Parerga* and *Under the Cedars and the Stars*, one might as well ask what superior merit there is in any of those classical collections of reflections, maxims, and pen pictures which have made men like La Bruyère im-

mortal. Withal, it is proper to add, in Canon Sheehan's philosophical musings there is no trace of the bitterness that keeps cropping up in these others. No—the verdict of very trustworthy critics everywhere runs directly counter to Mr. Colclough's estimate.

His article, however, is not all blame. "Was then," he continues, "Sheehan's brief career as a *littérateur* passed completely in vain? Not so."

There is one book worth more than all his novels put together—a book that deals with the concrete facts of time and eternity, a book which Irish and English Catholics the world over, will not, if they are wise, willingly let go into forgetfulness. . . . Canon Sheehan needs no monument so long as *Mariae Corona* is extant. . . . For one reader who bought *Mariae Corona*, published at two shillings and sixpence, a hundred bought *My New Curate*, published at six shillings. Yet if I may be allowed in this connexion to borrow a sapient and facile phrase from the Cockney school of criticism, *Mariae Corona* is "pure gold throughout". . . The work is unique in English Catholic literature, and every page exhales the sweet odor of the Holy Spirit. It will live, as the work of a great spiritual teacher deserves to live, for the enlightenment of generation after generation of Catholics, when *Lisheen* and *Parerga* and the rest of them are forgotten.

We have no quarrel with this opinion, much as it is out of proportion with what goes before in Mr. Colclough's critique. Quite unconsciously perhaps, but none the less truly, does it reveal the value which Canon Sheehan himself set upon his work as a writer of books. He gave less thought and care indeed to the composition and precision of his novels than he did to that of his written sermons. That fact merely shows how much higher he rated his priestly calling as an exponent of God's word at the altar, than his gifts as a popular writer. It does not justify the conclusion which Mr. Colclough draws.

When comparing Canon Sheehan to Father Faber, he writes:

Sheehan, with perhaps equal capacity for spiritual teaching, and withal a cultured Irish Catholic's clear insight into the splendours and the terrors of the life behind the veil, elected to abide in the lower spaces of the world, even at the mountain's foot, and plait perishable nosegays for passing pilgrims.

Whatever talent Canon Sheehan had for the exposition of spiritual truth—and those who came under the spell of his convincing and forceful preaching attest its wonderful attraction—his rare power to portray actual life in a sphere only partially understood by the great mass of even our Catholic people, placed him in a unique position as a novel-wright. His fiction, so far as it includes his clerical novels, is not only good story-telling, but also serves the purpose of raising the actual standard of sacerdotal aspirations and conduct in such a way as to be understood and desired by the average reader. The missionary and spiritual influences therefore of these books have become far more potent and widespread than that of our most popular ascetical writers, within their particular spheres. A prominent Irish ecclesiastic voiced the general sentiment of the clergy at the time *My New Curate* was first appearing in these pages, by writing: "If the young priests of our diocese were to read this story several times thoughtfully, the effect would be deeper and more lasting than the annual retreats." Canon Sheehan's Ordinary, the Bishop of Cloyne, took the story with him on his episcopal visitation tour, to read snatches from it, after dinner, for the edification of his priests. No ascetical book would have answered the same purpose.

As to the late Canon's other writings, they are doubtless of various degrees of literary merit. It is but fair to the writer of *My New Curate*, and *Luke Delmege*, as well as of *Mariae Corona*, to remember that their author valued his gifts of writing only as a supplement to his pastoral duties. He cared less for literary expression than for the effective presentation of truth. Hence he never revised the manuscript of his novels. He simply wrote *currente calamo*, or with the same fluency as a teacher tells a story for the purpose of illustrating a moral. His heart was far more active in turning the treasures of his experience and imagination to good account through his stories, than was his intellect or his conscious sense bent on winning the fame of a literary artist. Those who did not know him personally did not realize this; they took for granted that he wrought as other producers of classic work. As a matter of fact, the writing of novels was only the Canon's recreation made useful in the furtherance of his other more important tasks of instructing and leading souls in their quest of eternal life.

Remarkably few persons knew Canon Sheehan's inner life. As an intellectual man, a man of high spiritual aims, of noble efforts in the search after perfection through constant self-improvement and sacrifice, he stood apart from his surroundings at Doneraile. He had few friends with whom he could talk intimately at any time. Not that the men with whom he came in contact through his literary or his pastoral relations were incapable of reaching up to his standard; but, as Aubrey de Vere puts it,

An impalpable resistance
Holds like natures at a distance.

Of his intimate friends two in particular have shown that they appreciated fully the quality of his mind and heart. One of these was Father Matthew Russell, S.J. The other—strange as it may seem—is Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, of the Supreme Court of the United States. Father Russell is dead, but he has left in his letters the record of his friendship for the Canon. Justice Holmes, during his visits to Lord Castle-town in Ireland, came into frequent and close personal contact with Canon Sheehan. By an instinct that draws men of kindred spirit to each other, he recognized the superior intellectual and spiritual endowments of the Irish priest. Their subsequent relations, as revealed in their unbroken correspondence, illustrate the high character of both men, each in his sphere.

So much for Mr. Colclough's strange "Reminiscence and Appreciation". Of the larger aspects of Canon Sheehan's influence, not only as a writer but also as a model pastor and patriot, more anon, in another place.

THEORIES ABOUT THE TIME THE SOUL ENTERS THE BODY.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In a discussion touching the advent of the soul and its union with the body, there are some features of the subject matter involved that are not debatable. These are in the nature of postulates and have an imperative claim to recognition.

We must reckon, for example, with the unequivocal truths, the inexorable facts, that man, composed of two essential principles constituting one nature, is begotten by man; that one of these constitutive factors, the soul, is man's substantial

form; and that the soul is created by God. Taken separately, these assertions are as unquestionable as the proposition that two and two make four. It is only when combined that they enunciate a paradox. But whether singly or conjointly studied, they are, to the comfort or dismay of the disputant, absolutely unassailable.

And if this were not embarrassment enough in inquiring how man begins to be, we have the superadded difficulty of keeping intact, and right side up, certain metaphysical conceptions that are fitful and elusive at the best. All our statements, whether surmises or conclusions, must consist with the genuine notion of the soul as a substantial form—its status, attributes, and functions in this capacity. We have thus to calculate the characteristics, and capabilities, or caprices, of a spiritual force energizing as a constitutive principle in a physical compound. Another circumstance to be kept in view is that we are trying to explain a fact that may very well be incomprehensible, viz. generation.

Doubtless there are other obstacles known only to the expert, pitfalls innumerable for the incautious theorizer; but the fore-cited are at all events sufficient to make us beware of loose reasoning, or easy inferences, or flippant allegations in attempting to determine the exact moment that,

Not in entire forgetfulness,
And not in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God who is our home

to enter the body.

Of course no one knows, for it has thus far baffled the efforts of philosophy and experimental science to ascertain, at what particular stage of individual evolution the human soul is created. However, to those who truly recognize the spirituality of man, it will always be a fascinating theme for speculation. To those who do not, and their name is legion, the question is only an idle fancy founded on an unwarranted supposition.

Until a comparatively recent day (say the middle of the last century) it was commonly taught by all who wrote authoritatively on the subject, that the soul was not united with the body at conception, but at a subsequent phase of advanced

gestation. The precise moment of this union in the process of man's coming into being was assigned in rather a negative way. It was indicated approximately by explaining the laws of procreation as observed in nature. Philosophers thus set it down that in view of the soul's essential qualities and functions as the substantial form of man, it could not in the nature of things be infused until the organized receptacle, provided for its lodgment, had been raised by vital action to a constitutional potentiality that fitted it to coalesce, and enabled it to coöperate with a rational principle of life. This was simply nature's way of reproducing man, as they had been able to observe it.

The procreative act once effected attains its end, they said, achieves the full scope of its capabilities, only as the consequence of a development produced by the native vital efficiency of the germinal factors. And as this result is a human being, and as it is the outcome of a gradual evolution, the time equation has to be considered.

It was pointed out that a live individual in the constitution of actual reality is a substantive creature of a specific nature begotten by generation. Now, generation as a way to nature, as the means of becoming a self-sufficing, outstanding, subsistent entity in creation, is a circumscribed process of *growth* from a beginning through a continuation to a finish. There is a preëstablished ambit within whose compass generation takes place, or the word has no meaning. It is a progressive series of organic changes, or vital actions, conducted by an energizing principle making for a definite end. And not until, but just as soon as, this end is attained is generation complete. So that at the completion of generation, and simultaneously with it—identical, in fact; for it is the completion—does the individual of a specific nature come into existence, is alive. Then, and not till then, does any living creature full-fledged in all essentials begin to be in the recognized species of its kind. In other words, this point of time indicates the advent of the substantial form—in the instance of man, the rational soul.

For nature does not operate by leaps and bounds. She makes no abrupt transformations; nor does she leave unaccountable hiatuses in her wake. In the reproduction of her

creatures she moves through consecutive transitions, and measurably evolves the issue by a visible, if incomprehensible, process, from the simplest elements to the finished product. In considering then the procreation of a human being with special reference to the exact moment he begins to be, precisely as such, we are confronted with a question of time. It may be long or short, but some reckonable period must be allowed. The union of body and soul in man makes his reproduction an accomplished fact. This is the exact moment he begins to be as man. The inference is then inevitable that the soul is infused some time after the initial act of generation takes place; that is, at a phase subsequent to fertilization.

This conclusion of course depends on the doctrine above outlined, that generation is a state of inception of an appreciable length. Which in turn resolves itself into the disjunctive—either there is no such thing as passive generation, a prolonged inchoative reproduction, or it is to be recognized in the processes of oogenesis and spermatogenesis. In other words, the act of mating is generation proper. When it is duly effected, the new creature is begotten. For the soul is the root reason, the fundamental cause why man is man. At its coming, and in pursuance of the work already done by the agents that have evoked it, it makes the aspiring fetus a human being. The effect of the soul's appearance in the subject, which its precursors have transmuted, developed, and disposed for its arrival, is instantaneous. All this subject lacks of being the creature intended by nature in generation is the soul, and this, in giving its being to the fetus, by and of itself causes the fetus to become a man in actual reality. Or, to be exact, it assumes the fetus into its own being, and they both constitute a man. This change, as is apparent, occurs in an indivisible moment. It is the last act in the work of reproduction, the finishing stroke of nature's efforts in generation. It is the completion and fulfilment of the function undertaken at conception. For this reason, as above explained, it is not contemporaneous with conception.

Such is the prevalent psychology of that school which alone has handled metaphysics with any show of scientific coherence and consistency, and philosophic sense, viz. the Aristotelic-Thomistic. It is still maintained by the leading authorities in

Scholastic Philosophy, in so far as they venture to express any opinion on the matter.

Latterly, however, even among the upholders of Scholastic Philosophy, there has arisen a tendency to discard the traditional notion about a gradual process of embryonic and fetal growth, before the advent of the soul. This theory is that the creative act of infusion is a concomitant of pronuclear fusion, that is, that the union of body and soul is coincident with generation as effected by the parents. The philosophic argument proposed in support of the view is practically this: "Since the substantial form is the principle of vegetative and sensitive as well as of intellectual life *in man*, there seems to be no reason why the *embryo* should be informed by other than a rational soul." For, although intelligence is not evident until a later stage of growth, nature intended the procreation of a man from the first, and not a horse or a tree. There is nothing incongruous in maintaining that the embryo at its inception is a human being composed of body and soul. As man advances from incipency through the stages of his early evolution toward a perfect grade of life, he manifests a low order of vitality only, and bears a generic resemblance to plants and animals. There is nothing strange about this, for as a matter of fact he is, in a measure, constitutionally both of these; though he transcends them in the attribute of rationality, his exclusive prerogative. From the outset these forms of organization are gradually introduced, which are proper to man, and which must subsequently administer to his rational life. Specifically they are the power of immanent action found in the vegetative order, plus the quality of spontaneous endeavor possessed by animals, to which is added the overruling attribute of freedom in movement as enjoyed by man. It is, therefore, reasonable to assume concerning the embryo, what is an acknowledged fact at a later stage, namely, that the vital activity it displays is attributable to the rational soul. By its own virtue the soul thus constitutes and elaborates unto itself a body for the function of human life to be.

Such is the philosophic support of the theory that the soul is in the embryo. It can be prolonged at pleasure, as there is no end of the negative appeals to the congruous, or apologies for the "*nil admirandum*" in nature.

The point of this argument is that nature in each instance intended the reproduction of a human being from the first. What follows purports to be a proof that she begins to carry out her intention, to realize her purpose, by having the soul infused at the moment of conception. To many this reasoning seems eminently satisfactory, though it is very far from demonstration. As an isolated hypothesis left to convince or conciliate the inquirer by its own merits it can hardly be called compelling. From a scientific viewpoint it is not exactly an improvement on the old. No doubt they are both very largely conjecture as to the exact moment. But this has the fatal defect of assuming as a fact the point to be proved. Such an assumption is perhaps excusable in the circumstances; and only becomes censurable when it is not substantiated. But then there is the obvious objection that it ignores to no purpose the idea of that intermediate process of beginning to be, which is said to occur as a necessary progress from the germ to the full-blown flower. This theory has no interval between seed-time and harvest. In a word, it excludes the notion of development in generation. It thus repudiates Aristotelic-Thomistic principles. This alone might not altogether discredit the theory from a biological outlook, as neither Aristotle nor St. Thomas was an expert embryologist. But another and a more serious objection to it is that science itself rejects it. Not for the reason that it is an unsupported assumption, for these often turn out to be facts; but because it is unverified, and unverifiable. It is not only, as would seem, not an ascertainable fact in embryology, but in view of some well-established biological data, and in accordance with the nature of the human soul, it becomes even an impossible hypothesis. It is therefore an outcast from both philosophy and experimental science. A moment's consideration will evince this.

In view of the circumstance that our positive knowledge about the primordial cell of the human embryo is based chiefly, if not entirely, on analogy from observations made with animals, we are obliged to accept as true of this cell whatever has been demonstrated to be an embryological fact in other instances. We are compelled moreover to make our pronouncements about its characteristics and possibilities according to our knowledge. This is surely as undeniable as it is elemen-

tary. Now, it is a well known phenomenon that polyembryony normally obtains in some animals, and it is an ascertained fact that it can be induced at various stages of embryonic growth. So that what is actually *one* as a fertilized ovum, is potentially *many* in reality. The first embryonic cell has this intrinsic capability that, if for some reason, or foible, at the two-cell stage (or later) the cells become disparted, the separate parts will develop into individuals.

Natural phenomena, then, and other verified data establish polyembryony as a truth of biology. Of course this includes the human embryo. Arguing from analogy, and from knowledge otherwise at hand, biologists believe that it is constituted and conditioned like the embryo of animals. It is thus possible for the two cells of the human embryo to become disjoined at the two-cell stage, and for each of them to develop into a human being. Biologists have no reason to think differently. On the contrary, they are confronted with the fact of (so-called) identical twins, which suggests that their opinion is as good as proved. It needs not change their attitude that speculators have worked out a variety of explanations. This adventitious feature does not matter at all. The significance centres in the fact itself as reasonably accounted for by the potential nature of the fecundated egg. The psychologic impossibility of two absolutely identical creatures is likewise satisfactorily met. For biologists, considering the geometric increase of the chromosomal pairs, will allow even as wide a margin as one chance of identity in a million; which amounts to the impossible. In the absence, then, of any proof, or plausible presumption to the contrary, it must be held as antecedently probable that the human zygote is potentially polyembryonic, at the two-cell stage at all events.

This is why biology discards as untenable the theory we are discussing. And rightly so; unless a higher science, to which biology must defer, demonstrates its reason for recognition. The point to be made is that the human zygote is in fact an exception to the general law. It has to be shown that, because of the presence of the rational soul, it is *not* susceptible of disunion at the two-cell stage with the capability of developing as two individuals.

The opinion that this can be done has its advocates; but the exposition leaves much to be desired both in matter and method.

We have already seen that the psychological argument offered in proof of this contention is merely an assumption, and that recognized truths of biology compel us to disallow it, even as a guess. For the potential unity of the primitive cell must be established to make the indwelling of the soul possible.

Those who undertake to establish this from embryologico-metaphysical data fare no better. They either begin by positing the rational soul in the fertilized ovum, and then use this to prove that the zygote cannot be potentially multiplex. Or again, quite ignoring the natural composition of the zygote, as produced by the germ-cells, and having "fixed" these cells as a prerequisite, they conclude that the primordial cell must be informed by a rational soul, because of the constitution they themselves have assigned it. Thus, from the circumstance that a six months old infant has a body adequately organized for the presence of the soul, it is declared that the same is true of the fecundated egg, and that the soul is of course in it. Otherwise we should have to admit that the human embryo is a something unclassified until the rational soul turns it into a human being. Which would absurdly make the soul an efficient cause. Whereas the soul is a formal cause. This pronouncement based on a knowledge of the embryo in its capacity of to have and to hold may be biological enough, but it is not very logical.

To consider the last first in appraising it—the soul is essentially an efficient cause. It is a constitutive principle of the body, which necessarily implies efficiency. The word form or formal is used metaphorically in psychology. The entitative notion which attaches to the soul as a cause of or in the body, or the waking individual, is primarily and radically that of effectiveness. True, the soul is listed under the title "formal" in the catalogue of causes, but this is a figure of speech, a mere formality. The designation, human embryo, gives the thing designated all the classification it requires, and all that expert classifiers allow it. Prescinding from the time-aspect of the matter, it is quite proper, even philosophically considered, to say that the soul on its arrival *turns* its waiting

counterpart (call it what you will) into a human being. This is precisely the soul's "formal" function. The finical in philosophy, however, insist on being meticulously correct, and they say that the soul and its counterpart combine to constitute a human being. Finally, the antecedent of the argument presumably means this: all the faculties of the soul operate in the body by means of organs; but for the exercise of the other faculties, it is not necessary that the organs required to administer to the intellectual faculties be fully developed; otherwise how do we know that a six months old infant has a rational soul? Which is surely much ado made about nothing. The query is without philosophic sense. As to the empirical force of the argument, the only feature worth while, the answer is plain. Our senses assure us that an infant of any age is a human being, and therefore we know it has a rational soul. But we have not this proof in the case of the embryo. And for want of some such guarantee we may not assign it a rational soul.

This is the attitude maintained by the upholders of the first theory above outlined. The argument used is elementary with them. In the study of nature, they explain, phenomena are our only data, and we must restrict our conclusions about things to what they manifest to us. So long, then, as an analysis of the embryo reveals a vegetative, or a sensitive life only, this is all we are justified in ascribing to it; because it is all we know about it. A step further and you are indulging your fancy beyond the confines of philosophic and scientific research. You are either conjuring up beings there is no call for, or, as in the present instance, you are assigning causes that have no reason of existence in the explanation of visible facts adequately accounted for without them.

We have this same attitude proclaimed and pleaded for by Dr. Wilson, the illustrious embryologist of Columbia University. It chances that he is speaking *ex professo* too. As reported in his Presidential Address of last year to the American Association for the Advancement of Science, among many illuminating observations on embryology he has this: "We must hold fast to the methods by which all the great advances in our knowledge of nature have been achieved. We shall make lasting progress only by plodding along the hard beaten

trail blazed by our scientific fathers . . . the way of observation, comparison, experiment, analysis, synthesis, prediction, verification."

As with the philosophers, so it is with the scientists in their own province. They are both chary of unverified statements. In fact when they have enumerated in detail all they know about the primordial cell, the only inference they venture to make in the effort to prove it has a rational soul, is this, "In other words it is alive". But the germ-cells are also alive. Indeed the vitality of the embryo is the proof of this. Now these cells conjugate by their own energy and in pursuance of a definite end; each contributing its share of the issue. This is more than a mere physical or chemical change that is over and done with. The act of fusion is only one in a series of purposeful events having an outlook beyond the stage already attained. The pronuclear union is undesirably the proper product of the teleological impulses of the germ cells. And the principle of immanent action that thence emerges is an effect whose adequate cause is the germ cells in fusion. The result from a genetic viewpoint is the primordial cell. It is unscientific, therefore, to assume that this first embryonic cell is endowed with a vital principle other in source or in kind than that brought to it by the germ cells at fertilization. What data have we for thinking that the zygote needs or contains any principle of life except the one that arises out of the gametes in conjugation?

It is evident then that both psychology and science, scholastics and biologists, agree in admitting that the sum total of their knowledge about the primordial cell in generation amounts to this: it is a living thing dowered with wondrous potentiality, which it exerts for self-development in a manner very largely unknown to us! The authority already quoted puts this quite frankly: "Thirty years after Roux's pioneer researches we are constrained to admit that in spite of all that we have learned of development the egg has not yet given up its inmost secret." The same is true *a fortiori* of the first cell of the embryo. There is not a shred of evidence offered to support the assertion that the rational soul is the principle (in the cell) responsible for this development. Just as there is no reason to show, or even conjecture that the appearance

of the substantial form is coincident with fertilization in the reproduction of animals.

This seems the proper place to consider an argument bearing on the question, which (its propounders allege) is corroborative evidence that they are right in assuming the rational soul to be the only source of life in the first embryonic cell. This argument is founded on the fact, well authenticated it seems, that human cells will proliferate separated from the parent organism, that tissue-formation is feasible *in vitro*. Of course if isolated cells and tissue increase and multiply, they certainly have within them a vital principle which is not the rational soul. And the reasonable, the only conceivable way to account for it is to recognize it as the life that originally flowed from the parents into the germ cells, and from them to the first embryonic formation, and thence onward to the tissue as it now survives. Such is at least the manifest, the natural, the common-sense explanation. This is, however, discountenanced by the advocates of rational life only in the zygote. They object to it for the obvious, if not the real, reason that, while the fact itself suggests the untenableness of their theory, the proffered explanation, if sustained, would demolish it utterly. For this solution preserves the life of the nuclei, as against the theories attempting to be rid of it. And it proclaims the continuation of this life in the primitive cell, quite irrespective of the ulterior and irrelevant question about the advent of the soul. It is time enough to invoke the aid of a rational principle when we are confronted with conditions that defy explanation without it. This is the recognized method, and there must be a valid reason for abandoning it. The crisis at issue seems to be such a reason. There would appear to be a call in the circumstances for something technical and elaborate. Since the soul cannot be made responsible for living tissue cultivated outside the body, this must be accounted for otherwise. Hence we are told that the tissue acquires a new vital principle "educated from the potency of matter", while you wait! This expression belongs exclusively to Scholastic Philosophy. According to the scholastics (and it sounds sensible) there are only two possible ways of coming into the world—creation and education. They recognize two essential factors in living things—the vital principle

and the vitalized subject. The absolute production of these two factors in a creature they call Creation—"Regis opus." And the production of the vital principle in preëxisting matter to constitute an individual, or, procreation, is known as Education—the work of creatures. This is the simple truth of the matter. The formula just means *reproduction* in its every-day sense, neither more nor less. It is rather surprising to find it so oddly misunderstood. The misapprehension is similar to the one already treated above, the soul being a formal, but not an efficient cause. This expression "educated from the potency of matter", also involves a metaphor, and it has a figurative sense only. It means literally, as employed by the Scholastics, that the matter is aptly disposed for the oncoming form, and that the form is brought into being as the work of natural agents in the *reproduction of their kind*. It is applied to accidental changes, to substantial transformations, to procreation in general, and to the begetting of the individual Fido. In short, it is an exact equivalent of "reproduced". Even so it has a wide range; but with all its comprehensiveness there are some phenomena to which it is inapplicable. As an hypothesis for explaining proliferation *in vitro*, to prove the presence of the rational soul in the zygote, it is an unequivocal failure.

Thus ends the legal currency, so to say, of the pronuclear fusion theory about the creation of the individual soul. Its only claim to recognition has been the reputation of its advocates. But the established right to speak with authority on biology, fortified and freshened by however much assertiveness or sincerity, cannot withstand the urgency of known facts. This is the cause of the collapse. However, in an age so busy revealing nature's laws some one may yet come forth with an explanation from experimental science, that will be more in harmony with the psychologic system elaborated by the genius of Aristotle and St. Thomas working in their proper atmosphere.

J. T. MURPHY.

Charlottetown, P. E. I., Canada.

THE SCARCITY OF PRIESTS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Recently there appeared in the *Literary Digest* a note to the effect that, owing to the shortage of priests in Europe, the East was appealing to the West for suitable candidates for the sacred ministry.

Considering that the West has always been to some extent dependent on the East for its clergymen, and that the war has all but emptied our seminaries of students, it is clear that the Church, both in the Old World and the New, will soon be in sore straits finding sufficient laborers for the Lord's vineyard.

The ordinary source of supply looks as if it will be totally cut off; for if conscription does not rob us entirely of the youth of the country (and the barrack room is hardly the place to develop vocations, though it may have housed a St. Ignatius), the greater facilities for travel, adventure, and perilous enterprise will make a stronger appeal to the imagination and the heart of the young.

In the current number of the *Literary Digest* it is stated that the Dominican, Prior McNabb suggests the admitting to Orders of married converts who have been clergymen. Whatever may be said in favor of this idea, it makes no appeal at first to the Catholic mind.

There are however in most communities not a few men who, because of their religious temperament and excellent Catholic training, never seem to be at ease in the world in which they live and move; sociable fellows enough, but too piously inclined to take any pleasure in the petty frauds, the officious lying, the smutty jokes, the saloon, and the far from innocent frivolities which have become almost the only form of relaxation from the cares and worries of life. Every priest can point out one or two model bachelors in his congregation, members of confraternities and sodalities ever ready and willing to do all for the Church, the right hands of poor and struggling missions.

These men may be advancing in years, but they know the world intimately. They have battled with it and have learnt its pitfalls as well as its temptations. They are business men in some shape or form and can take care of the cents as well as

the dollars. The thought of matrimony has never occurred to them seriously, or the duty of providing for parents and relations has prevented them from entertaining it. Religion is to them real and tangible, something they would like to know intimately for the fuller satisfaction of their trust in God. They are lost in the society of their fellows, for small talk bores them, and they are not at home with the cleric because of lack of training. They would like to be able to battle successfully with the scoffer and the materialist, but they have no complete guide, philosopher, and friend. To suggest to these men that they should enter seminaries and become priests would be about the quickest way to turn their thoughts from the idea. The objections to them are obvious. They are no longer young and flexible-minded and could not possibly compete with youngsters. They have long since thrown off the things of a child, and while the transition from youth to age is natural, to reverse the order is impossible until one reaches one's dotage. They have settled habits the eradication of which may undermine their health. They have very little or no capital to fall back on and no guarantee of employment in case of failure. The age limit in business is rather a serious objection to a man looking for work. The study of metaphysics is a poor foundation for the salesman or the engineer; and a conscientious man, after a few years' constant study of the *Summa* without any business cares or worldly distractions, would not be a very serious competitor against the modern manufacturer and the soulless Trust. No. To suggest the seminary would be wrong. Ordinary tact, good judgment and common sense cry out against it. The individuals themselves would be the first to resent it, seeing only their unworthiness.

But just as many of them have lately taken up the study of sociology and kindred subjects in order the better to be able to defend the Church against the assaults of the atheist and the socialist, so the suggestion that they should take a systematic course of study in religion, and to that end in the study of Latin and Church History and Scripture, would, I think, meet the approval of many of them.

We have schools of Sociology, Medicine, and Law; evening classes in trades, crafts, and professions; correspondence classes in Science, Literature and Art. Why not organize some such

school, class, or correspondence course in Latin and Theology? Schools and classes in large centres of population, correspondence courses for those who cannot attend these classes and schools? The student takes up the study not so much with the ulterior motive of becoming a priest but with the view of becoming better instructed in matters of faith and morals, better qualified to impart such instruction to others and to give proof of the faith that is in him. Having completed his studies as a hobby and having passed the final tests, the suggestion of becoming a priest would appeal to many, especially when they know that the study and the examination part of the work is done with. The student of course should be informed from the first that the way to ordination will be made easy for him if he desires it. When the course is finished, a few months in a seminary or as sacristan in a church might be insisted on for the study of the Rubrics, etc., and to give the candidate a more intimate knowledge of the life he intends to adopt.

This method of imparting instruction may not produce any great scholars, deep thinkers, or eloquent speakers. The student may not be able to win any academic distinction; but it is not the priest with a tail end to his name like the keyboard of a typewriter that is always the successful missionary. The Curé d'Ars was no genius; and the simple priest will always appeal to the largest congregation. Our students may not be able to translate a dozen selected lines from Cæsar or Cicero fluently or correctly, but they know all about the temptations of business and the worries of domestic life. They know the exact value of every penny and have nothing to learn about social wrongs and public evils. They may not be able to give expression to the Scholastic point of view even in Church Latin, but there is very little in the moral code that they will not be able to instruct their penitents on in the language the penitent understands and with that sympathy of understanding that quickly reaches the penitent soul.

The idea is worth trying. It is cheaper than the present system in the long run; for there is no drain on the ecclesiastical funds for subsistence; and in most cases the student will be able to contribute for the instruction imparted. If he succeeds, there is a good, practical priest in the Church. If he fails, there is a practical, well-instructed Catholic in the world.

And age should be no bar. It is never too late to learn. And the Apostles evidently were not chosen because of their youth.

There is another class of men who must not be overlooked in this matter, the ex-cleric or the "spoiled priest", as the late Canon Sheehan of Doneraile called him. Boys will be boys, and restrictions and discipline in ecclesiastical colleges, however necessary they may be, are of such a nature that it is no small wonder that a big percentage of candidates fail to continue to the end and that some are expelled. The difficulties of getting elsewhere and the obstacles which arise to the continuing of their course drive these young men into occupations which they detest from lack of training, and into surroundings which stifle and crush their very natures; for their education makes them misunderstood. In a few short years they recognize what they have missed and would gladly avail of the opportunity of becoming priests, but their early record is a barrier. Why not cut down the barrier? Father Mathew, the great apostle of Temperance, was expelled from Maynooth.

BARRY GOOD.

HOW OUR CLERGY ARE RECRUITED.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

At a recent clerical gathering, one of the number proposed this rather extraordinary question, "How is it that parishes with schools conducted by religious teachers furnish few or no candidates for the priesthood?" The protest almost universal which arose, as it were instinctively, was met by a review of the situation in our own diocese, the facts adduced being in almost perfect accord with the first speaker's contention. Various attempts to explain the paradox were then forthcoming, each in turn falling to the ground, as instance after instance was cited in flat contradiction of the theory advanced, until at length a voice from down the table suggested: "The whole matter is perfectly clear. Parochial schools and religious teachers are mostly in the cities and larger towns of the dioceses. We need never expect to recruit our ranks from those sources." Another citation of cases followed; such contrasts

as that of a country parish of only four hundred souls, with no parish school, having thirteen priests in actual service in the diocese, and city parishes of four thousand souls but having no native priests, seemed to lend some confirmation to the view. One remarkable piece of evidence was of a city pastor, well known to all present and known as a man truly zealous in everything, who had made every conceivable sacrifice to foster vocations to the priesthood, who had evinced a rare discernment in the selection of boys encouraged to continue their studies, and who reported that from thirty-four boys sent from his parish to the diocesan college the total result was one priest.

The discussion had grown in interest. Some of us pursued it to the extent of going over the diocesan lists, the figures in which revealed that over eighty per cent of our clergy come from parishes distinctly rural, although two-thirds of the Catholic population are located in cities and towns. The rector of the diocesan seminary was next consulted. He stated that three-fourths of the students in actual attendance had grown up on the farm. Some of the priests interested in the inquiry enjoyed a familiar acquaintance with conditions in two other dioceses the titular cities of which have a Catholic population of about 50,000 and 250,000 respectively. The former of these has furnished thirteen of the present diocesan clergy, the latter sixty. In this investigation no effort was made to ascertain the birthplace; each priest was accredited to the parish in which his family resided at the time of his entering college. The highest result, therefore, these two cities can claim, is one priest from every four thousand Catholics; each nine hundred families furnishes one recruit to the ministry.

Since that time, with the aid of the Ecclesiastical Directory and census publications, we have endeavored to learn in what proportion city and country parishes in the United States are respectively contributing to the staffs of diocesan clergy. No account has been taken of the regular clergy, whose location in a diocese gives no clue, of course, to their place of birth or training. Paper information is at best second-class authority. The statements we venture to make with the information at our disposal any reader can revise with accuracy,

at least as far as his own diocese is concerned. The inquiry did not extend to the newer or scattered dioceses of the West and South, conditions there up to the present time having been such as to preclude the possibility of recruiting a native clergy. The line of division aims at separating rural districts and smaller towns from larger towns and cities. In some cases it was impossible to ascertain the exact population of towns under consideration, and we agreed to class all towns having two or more parishes with the larger.

The following tables record the result:

NAME OF DIOCESE	CATHOLIC POPULATION FURNISHING ONE DIOCESAN PRIEST	NUMBER OF PARISHES	
		IN CITIES AND LARGER TOWNS	IN SMALLER TOWNS AND COUNTRY PLACES
Baltimore	1,370	84	60
Boston	1,600	166	82
Chicago.	2,000	273	58
Cincinnati.	875	90	91
Dubuque	460	22	150
Milwaukee	830	110	114
New York.	1,700	238	74
Philadelphia.	1,250	197	82
St. Louis	1,300	107	134
St. Paul.	900	73	133
Albany	1,000	73	63
Alton.	550	33	84
Altoona.	1,270	40	47
Belleville	550	19	81
Brooklyn	1,450	140	75
Buffalo	1,140	107	83
Burlington	950	18	86
Cleveland	1,380	130	54
Columbus	870	38	58
Covington	880	22	38
Davenport	450	29	63
Des Moines	480	12	45
Detroit	1,540	72	98
Erie	900	40	66
Fall River	1,260	59	15
Fort Wayne	720	62	68
Grand Rapids	1,060	52	56
Green Bay	860	45	111
Harrisburg	900	38	41
Hartford	1,450	110	85
Indianapolis	790	41	101
Kansas City	830	37	39
Leavenworth	690	29	64

NAME OF DIOCESE	CATHOLIC POPULATION FURNISHING ONE DIOCESAN PRIEST	NUMBER OF PARISHES	
		IN CITIES AND LARGER TOWNS	IN SMALLER TOWNS AND COUNTRY PLACES
La Crosse.	690	31	113
Louisville.	880	48	61
Manchester.	1,025	34	43
Newark.	1,600	140	57
Ogdensburg.	750	15	78
Omaha.	550	27	83
Peoria.	640	66	90
Pittsburgh.	1,300	188	107
Portland.	1,050	24	57
Providence.	1,350	64	29
Richmond.	720	16	21
Rochester.	800	52	57
Rockford.	530	24	48
St. Cloud.	700	16	81
St. Joseph.	640	15	38
Scranton.	1,060	80	95
Sioux City.	500	22	83
Springfield.	1,000	87	93
Syracuse.	1,080	52	41
Toledo.	930	37	56
Trenton.	940	63	71
Wheeling.	700	17	48
Wilmington.	1,000	11	19
Winona.	530	10	71

If we recognize the time-honored standard—one priest for a thousand souls—it will be observed that the supply decreases the greater the proportion of the city parishes. This holds, with few exceptions, throughout, the dearth being especially notable in dioceses whose Catholic population is overwhelmingly urban. Such are Chicago, New York, Boston, Newark, Philadelphia, Brooklyn. On the other hand, dioceses in Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, or Wisconsin, where country parishes predominate and the large city is almost unknown, approach the standard of a priest for every five hundred souls. Moreover most dioceses with large city populations have been regularly adopting candidates for the priesthood from abroad. The contrary obtains in Iowa, Wisconsin, etc.

In examining the other forces which contribute to providing the diocesan clergy, it is worthy of note that New York, Brooklyn, Boston, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Buffalo, Newark,

have had for years their own preparatory colleges and ecclesiastical seminaries. It is interesting also to contrast, for example, Cleveland and Dubuque, which respectively enjoy the advantage of a college and seminary conducted by their own diocesan clergy. The contrast may also be instituted between Rochester and Philadelphia, or Rochester and Buffalo. Or we might examine Buffalo, provided with a seminary for generations, side by side with Erie, which has had neither a seminary nor preparatory college.

Or, if we are to believe that location, surroundings, climate, exert an influence in the matter, it might be well to compare Chicago with the other dioceses in Illinois, Harrisburg with Philadelphia, Wheeling with Pittsburgh, Columbus and Toledo with Cleveland.

CLERICUS.

DAY RETREATS OR MISSIONS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

All priests in charge of souls recognize the need of extraordinary agencies and efforts, from time to time, to instil new spiritual life and fervor into the hearts of our people. The means to secure this end are, as a general rule, the giving or preaching of a mission, and every pastor and missionary will testify to the good done by a mission when given under proper conditions. The good, practical Catholics are confirmed in their faith and piety, the lukewarm and indifferent are aroused, sinners are converted, and incidentally non-Catholics are brought into the fold.

Without, however, meaning for a moment to minimize or disparage the work and good of a mission, as it is commonly given, I hold and wish to prove the fact that, when it comes to real and lasting reformation and transformation of a parish or an individual parishioner, there is something far superior to the ordinary mission, and that is a mission in a special form and method, or what is called a "Lay Retreat" or a retreat given for the lay people.

A retreat, as everybody knows, is a retirement from the ordinary daily pursuits and occupations, so that one with all the energy and faculties of his mind may occupy himself

with the spiritual exercises in meditation upon the eternal truths of religion and the examination of his life, for the purpose of obtaining full pardon of past faults and sins, and to be converted into a new man—that is, created according to God in justice and true sanctity. Hence a twofold end is sought in and by the retreat—the settlement of the accounts of the past and the beginning of a new and more perfect life.

For those consecrated to God, whether in the sacred ministry or in the religious life, such a retreat made from time to time is a matter of the utmost importance and may be considered a necessity for progress and perseverance in the spiritual life. Hence in all religious communities and amongst the secular clergy we find the custom of an annual retreat lasting a week or the greater part of it. Now if for priests and religious, who spend some time every day in prayer and meditation, a retreat is an imperative need, and as every one, who has made it seriously, knows by personal experience, it is productive of the most beneficial results, is it not just as necessary and beneficial to our people living in this world and age of unbelief, materialism, sin and corruption, and absorbed, as they are, by the distractions, cares, and frivolities of everyday life? They hardly ever find or take time to reflect upon the serious side and problems of life, its origin, and aim for time and eternity.

Their faith is so weak and in consequence their life so faulty and so disorderly, precisely because they hardly ever take to heart the eternal truths of religion, and the meaning and destiny of their existence, and the disorders of their souls. "*Nemo est qui recogitat corde.*" The Sunday sermons, the reading of religious books and papers prevent the entire oblivion and loss of the faith. But because of lack of serious reflection and meditation, on the part of the people, the word of God does not yield the fruit it could and should.

What is needed is to bring home to them the truth of faith and the obligations it imposes, and as it were force them to take them to heart. They must chew, swallow and digest this bread of the soul. This is done and effectively done in a retreat, made by one particular class or group of people. To have the people retire to a certain place, a retreat house, then to engage in nothing but the spiritual exercises during the

days of the retreat, would be an ideal method, but practicable only for a very small number. The next best plan is to conduct the retreat after the fashion of a mission, the people attending the exercises for the space of a week—twice or, if possible, three times daily.

Between a mission and a retreat there is a vast difference. A mission is preached to all the people of the parish or a good portion of it, the people attending, on an average, half or the greater part of the sermons and instructions—rarely all. They then go to confession and Communion and thus they “make the mission.” Alas, soon afterward they relapse into their former ways and habits. The mission may be compared to a straw fire, burning briskly for the time being, but soon dying out.

On the other hand, a retreat is made by a set of people of one particular state of life. All belonging to it are urged to attend, and as a rule do attend, all the exercises from the first to the last. They are taught to reflect and meditate for some length of time upon the subjects discussed and adapted to the particular needs of those making the retreat, to apply them to themselves, to compare their lives with them, and to draw their own conclusions from them, that is to say, the earnest resolution to change and amend their lives.

At a mission the missionary preaches to the people; in the retreat the people are made to preach to themselves. In the former they listen to the voice of the speaker; in the latter they perceive the voice of their own heart and conscience, the voice of God’s grace. On the occasion of a mission they may be highly pleased with the speaker and praise his eloquence; in the retreat they will learn to be displeased with themselves and to turn over a new leaf.

During a retreat, given in a hall or any quiet and secluded place, the people get in much closer touch and contact, locally and psychically, with the priest conducting the exercises. It is a heart-to-heart talk, instead of the thundering and shouting at the audience that oftentimes must be done by the preacher of a mission.

Besides, to give a retreat, at least as far as the discourses are concerned, is a much easier task than the exhausting preaching of so-called mission sermons. Many more priests are

qualified to act as retreat masters than as missionaries. Another reason in favor of a retreat in preference to the ordinary mission is the fact of its being less expensive, since one priest can conduct the retreat alone. (For the confessions, other priests can easily be found to help out.) And experience goes to prove that the people at the end of the retreat will of their own accord, or perhaps upon the suggestion of the pastor, cheerfully and generously make an offering toward defraying all the expenses incurred. And thus the retreat will not be a drain on the parish, but rather the opposite. As is generally known, one of the principal things at a mission is the instruction on the duties of one's state of life, and at the retreat there is an equal, if not a better, opportunity to impart this instruction, so necessary for all, but especially for the married people.

It may be urged that a mission arouses more interest, stirs up more enthusiasm, and draws greater crowds than a retreat. The cause of God depends not on excitement, on show, on the flare of trumpets, on newspaper puffs and methods. The grace of God is wont to do its work in secret without leaving much room for ostentation and ambition. The prophet Elias did not see the Lord in a strong wind or in an earthquake or in fire, but in the whispering of a gentle breeze.

If a retreat given and made under proper conditions will not bring about a true and thorough change and conversion of the individual or the people, there is nothing, except a miracle of grace, that will.

Try it and you will be convinced, just the same as the author of this article, who for years has been engaged in giving missions, as also in conducting retreats.

FRANCISCAN MISSIONARY.

"IN THE MINDS OF THREE."

"But, my dear Father Maynes, I see nothing in my belief, which in any way conflicts with the truth and dogma of Catholicity. You designate my teachings as 'New Thought,' but I assure you that they represent only the highest standard of Catholicity. The trouble with you older pastors is that you do not understand the needs of our twentieth-century congre-

gations. It is necessary for the clergy to keep up with the march of civilization. The Church always has been, and must now be in the vanguard of the educated. Christ, the Great Teacher, adapted His teachings to His hearers. When He spoke to fishermen He used parables that treated of the taking of fish. When He spoke to tillers of the soil, He used the parable of the Sower and the Seed. He drew His material from the hearts and minds of His hearers, and so must we. When we preach to lawyers, we must prove God's Law to be the Supreme Law. When we preach to doctors, we must prove the truth of our doctrines from a medical standpoint; and when we argue with scientific men, we must use the scientific phenomenon in our reasoning. God knows, I love my religion as well as you do. I know that, as St. Augustine says, there is no true happiness save that which comes from God. The soul originates from the Great Author and never can be content until it reposes in Him. The happiest moments of my life are my moments at the altar, but if Darwin and the great scientists say man descended from a monkey, aye, even from an amoeba, I see no reason for trying to refute this. Let us rather take it and use it to our advantage. There is nothing in Catholic dogma to keep me from believing this, providing I hold that, at some time between the stage of man and beast, God stepped in and breathed into that creature an immortal soul. Again, if I take the seven days of creation, spoken of in Genesis, to represent seven periods of time, extending over thousands of years, and so agree with the Nebular Hypothesis regarding the conglomeration of atoms, I would be only treating the Biblical account as a parable, the same as many others in the New Testament. A simplified setting for an historical fact."

The Reverend Arthur Karney was rather proud of this exposition. Still under thirty, he had gained some renown as an apostle of modern thought. The parishoners liked the daring of his sermons and the spirit with which he upheld them. To Father Karney his superior was a kind, gentle, old man, assured of a seat in heaven. He was fond of children, who were forever scrambling at his coat-tails, and he delighted in quoting his Master's words, "Suffer little children to come unto me." He distributed coins to the worthy

and worthless alike, not having the heart to distinguish between them. As a confessor he was inclined to be lenient, extolling in God-loving rather than God-fearing terms. To these eccentricities, if they may be so called, Father Karney did not object, although he would have approved a haughtier bearing. It was as a theologian that he failed to agree with his pastor. The convictions of Father Maynes were too old-fashioned; utterly devoid of scientific reasoning. His sermons were childlike in their simplicity, and he was forever preaching the imperfections of the mind, the corruption of the reason, and the error of man's understanding. It was this which caused the present argument between the pastor and curate.

From his armchair Father Maynes made no refutation of the assistant's arguments. So deep was he in thought that he did not notice Father Karney's departure. Silently shaking his head he expressed unspoken pity for him who would make Catholicity meet the world's perception rather than have the world meet Catholicity.

Saturday evening came. The drop-light over his desk shed its light on the last pages of Father Maynes's manuscript as his kindly hand traced the simple words of the morrow's sermon.

"My children, God is love. He loves you all and He wants you to love Him. He has said, 'Anything you ask in My Name shall be given unto you'; and, in saying that He means also that anything you ask from His Blessed Mother shall be given you. Christ was a little child, like all the little children who play about our doorsteps. As they love their mothers, so He loves Mary, and He will do anything that she asks of Him. Come to the altar of Mary. Pray to her to intercede for you that her Divine Son may forgive you your sins."

Above, the younger disciple was similarly engaged. Theological works of the Spanish, German, and French doctors were spread before him. The incandescent rays, falling short of the features and spotless black cassock, rested on the words of the sermon prepared for a learned exposé on the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. A tap sounded and, in answer to the call of "Come", a young man entered. The priest's junior by a few years, he was fair and lightly built.

His face was finely chiseled, but the lips were a trifle large and denoted a worldly temperament. The chin was weakly-pointed, the brow high and intelligent, and the blue eyes were deep and close-set.

"Father, I am returning your books. I was very much interested in what is in them."

He had lifted a cigarette to his lips and was about to drop into platitudes when the priest's voice recalled him to serious thought.

"Ray, I have something to talk over with you to-night that I do not know how to broach. Yesterday in a few spare moments I picked up the medical journal of the college which you are attending. I came upon a number of articles written by students and, among them, one by yourself. A paper on Obstetrics. A wild, ungoverned attack on the Church law regarding the preservation of the foetus. That article was wrong, radically wrong. You have looked at the thing from a purely human standpoint and you do not possess the depth of clear, logical reasoning to appreciate the stand of the Church in the matter—a stand taken after years of scientific observation by the greatest thinkers of many ages. I brought this up because we have been close friends for some time. I have been your tutor in religion and in science. I have shown you that science and religion can be reconciled and yet religion will be master. I have told you the stand the Church has taken on the different questions affecting your profession, but, perhaps, I gave you credit for a reasoning power beyond your years; for, surely, in the question which I have just mentioned you are completely wrong."

The younger man dropped the cigarette and broke in impatiently.

"Father Karney, I believe according to my convictions, so do you. You read science and you read theology, and after reading both you believe more firmly in God. That is your conviction. I also have a right to form a conviction. I, too, have read theology and science. I, too, have formed a belief. From to-day forward theology is merely a branch of science to me. It is a study of psychic thought originating in the eccentricities of the finite mind. I am sorry that I have offended you, but my decision is final. Father Karney, good night!"

The priest rose and, leaning on his desk for support, stood staring at the door through which the boy had disappeared, a vague look on his face. The mouth drooped and the lips began to move.

"Oh God! Have I done wrong? They say a child must creep before he walks, and now I see that he is only a child. Have I led him into water beyond his depth? He did not see. He did not understand, and it is all my fault. Oh Mary, Mother of God, forgive him and deal to me the blame."

And, turning from the works of the great scientists, Father Karney based that Sunday's sermon on Thomas à Kempis's *Imitation of Christ*.

In his room Father Maynes, as though addressing his parishioners of the morrow, read aloud the concluding paragraph of his sermon.

"My children, consider the sorrows of Mary. From the moment of His birth each of the sorrows of her Divine Son was her sorrow. She loved Him with all the tenderness that a mother is capable of. She had brought Him forth from the Valley of Sorrow as each mother brings forth her child. She is the personification of true motherhood, and she should be imitated more to-day. With their new ideas, women of the present shirk motherhood; but model yourselves after Mary. Model yourselves after your own mothers, the good old Irish mothers of twenty-five or fifty years ago. They were not afraid of maternity. They loved their children and they would have died for them. They would have scorned you if you proposed that their child's life should be sacrificed that they might live. My children, these were your mothers—the good, old mothers of yester year."

Without, a young medical student listened, and, as the last words came to him, he fell on his knees before the closed door and murmured, "Oh God, forgive me—I believe."

(D—W)

RESTITUTION AND BANKRUPTCY.

Qu. John, a storekeeper, runs away to avoid being served with a summons in bankruptcy proceedings, and with evident intent to defraud his creditors. He leaves a wife and two children. His wife

continues to sell from the stock at reduced prices. Thomas, urged on by the thought of prospective profits, buys from John the automatic scales, platform scales, and cash register, valued at approximately \$200, for \$65, making a deposit of \$15. Besides these, he buys \$17 worth of groceries at reduced prices. One of John's creditors secured judgment against him for \$200, the scales and register which are now in Thomas's possession being included in the judgment.

(1) Can Thomas in conscience retain the articles purchased?

(2) Has John's wife any right to continue to sell the goods before the judgment is rendered?

(3) Must Thomas make restitution and, if so, to whom and in what amount?

Resp. Involving as it does considerations of civil as well as moral law, this case is by no means easy of solution. As can be seen, the answer depends upon the right of John's wife to dispose of the goods in the interval between the summons in bankruptcy and the judgment. For this reason let us take up first query 2. It may be remarked that from an *a priori* examination of the case the presumption is against John, since he ran away "with evident intent to defraud his creditors". "Fraudem nemo patrocinari debet." Nor is the presumption in favor of Thomas, since it is evident that he was well aware of the fraud which John was endeavoring to perpetrate, and which he sought to take advantage of. He can, therefore, be said to be a possessor in bad faith.

2. John's wife, in disposing of his goods, acted either with his consent or without it. Naturally, if she acted without his consent, her action is unlawful, since no one may dispose of another person's goods without his consent. If, however, she had John's consent, the question resolves itself to this: Had John the right to give his consent? His right to give the consent will depend on his right to dispose of the goods. Of course all theologians would deny this right to John after the judgment had been rendered; but we can find nothing clear on the question regarding the disposal of the property in the interval between the issuing of the summons and the rendering of the judgment. It is certain that the civil law forbids any such disposal of goods, and adequate measures are provided to prevent it. The point to be considered now is, whether the civil law in this case binds in conscience. Theo-

logians hold that civil laws, when just and made by competent authority, for the common good, bind in conscience. In the present instance these conditions are verified. In the first place, nobody will doubt the justice of such a law. Secondly, it must be admitted that the State is competent to interfere in, and to regulate the public contractual relations of its individual members. Finally, the fact that the law is for the common good is evident when we consider the manifest injustice that would be done to creditors were bankrupts allowed to dispose of their goods before the case had been judicially settled. Therefore the civil law forbidding the disposal of goods in the interval between the summons and the judgment binds in conscience. Consequently John had no right to dispose of his goods, and not having the right he could not confer it by consent on another. *Nemo dat quod non habet*. It may be remarked that in bankruptcy proceedings there is no legal necessity that the summons be served on the prospective bankrupt in person. This is the general theology of the question. Certain exceptions may, however, be admitted. The payment of claims in bankruptcy is a form of restitution. Restitution, however, is never obligatory *cum gravi incommodo*. Consequently the bankrupt is allowed to retain of his stock what is necessary for his self-preservation. The natural law, which is superior to any other law, prescribes self-preservation. *A fortiori* this is true of one who is not yet formally adjudged a bankrupt. In the present case this exception seems to be verified, for it is very probable that the wife and two children abandoned by John are in extreme need, and so the wife may provide sustenance out of the property. The goods, however, must be sold at a price equivalent to their approximate value. The reason for this is evident. As has been shown, the wife has no right to *dispose* of the goods, but because of her extreme need she may *use* them. Therefore, all she may do is to turn them into their equivalent cash value, and of the sum received use what she needs and do with the rest according to the prescriptions of the law. An exception, perhaps, may also be made in the case of the groceries, since they are very probably perishable goods. Goods that are perishable are, unless disposed of at once, of no value. Therefore it would be lawful to sell them in order to liberate them *a summo*

periculo. But the cash received for them must be retained for the owner, except that which is necessary for the preservation of life.

1. Let us now go back to the first query. As John's wife has no right to dispose of the goods, it follows that the contract "emptio—venditio" between her and Thomas is null and void. But this contract is the sole title that Thomas has to the goods, and as it is invalid, he cannot in conscience retain the goods, but is bound to restitution. *Res clamat ad dominum*.

3. Since Thomas is not the owner of the goods, he is naturally bound to make restitution. It cannot be urged that at the time of the sale the goods belonged to John; rather, at that time, legal proceedings were being taken to determine the real ownership of the property, and during this time the State, through its legitimate representative, had assumed temporary ownership of the goods. Now, however, the real ultimate owner of part of the property has been determined; to him therefore must restitution be made. Regarding the \$15 that Thomas has deposited, he has a right to recover this from John's wife; but should he fail to do this, he must suffer the consequences, and consider himself lucky in not having lost the remainder of the \$65. Some writers there are who hold that in this case it would be sufficient to restore the goods to the person from whom they have been received, that is, restore them to their original condition. Since, however, with regard to the scales, etc. the owner is already established, to him alone must the restitution be made. *Res clamat ad dominum*. John's wife is not the owner; why make restitution to her? As for the groceries, Thomas is bound to return them in full if they still exist. They do not belong to him; therefore he cannot keep them. If they have perished, we must distinguish. If it is Thomas's fault that they have perished, then he must restore their equivalent, since he is responsible for the injury caused by their loss. If the destruction of the goods is due to natural intrinsic causes entirely beyond Thomas's control, he is not bound to make restitution, since he cannot be considered theologically responsible for their loss. *Res perit domino*. To whom is this restitution of the

groceries to be made? In answer to this question, it would seem sufficient to return the goods to John's wife, that is to restore them to their original condition, because the owner has not yet been determined, and furthermore Thomas is entitled to recover the sum that he paid for them.

THE RESERVED CASE OF MARRIAGE BEFORE A NON-CATHOLIC MINISTER.

Qu. John comes to confession in Lent and acknowledges that fifteen years ago he had married a non-Catholic before a Protestant minister. The confessor, who is a pastor also, had in mind the recent decree of the Holy See and, remembering that the rectors of churches are given the faculty to absolve from diocesan reserved cases during the time that the Easter duty can be made, absolves the penitent. Was the pastor justified?

Resp. A Catholic who marries before a non-Catholic minister incurs the censure of excommunication, and this is not a diocesan or episcopal reserved case, but a papal one. It is a rather common mistake to regard such a marriage as a bishop's reserved case. The Holy See several years ago was asked whether absolution from censure was necessary in all cases of Catholics marrying before a non-Catholic minister or only in the dioceses where the bishop had put a censure on such marriages. The S. Congregation of the Inquisition, 29 August, 1888, answered that in all such cases the Catholic party needs to be absolved from the censure.

The question, then, is, under what head does this excommunication fall, since nowhere has the Holy See pronounced a special censure against such a marriage. The only censure under which this marriage can fall is the first of the excommunications of the Bull *Apostolicae Sedis*, specially reserved to the Pope—viz. "all apostates, heretics and those who believe them", etc. In the eyes of the Church a Catholic who goes before a Protestant minister for marriage is considered as a believer in the Protestant religion and a renegade to his Catholic faith. In fact, it is difficult to interpret his action in any other sense. It makes no difference whether the Catholic party fully realizes the meaning of his act, for even those least instructed in their religion know and feel that by such an

act they implicitly renounce their own faith and acknowledge the non-Catholic form of worship. Before the external forum of the Church they are guilty of an act that is tantamount to a denial of faith and they must be reconciled by the proper authority in order to be again admitted to the sacraments in the Catholic Church. The declaration of the Inquisition in the decree of 29 August, 1888, makes no distinction between those who know and those who do not know of the censure; it demands *in all cases of this kind* absolution from the censure. In number three of the decree the S. Congregation insists that the absolution is required not merely as a formality usual in dispensations from impediments granted to parties married before a minister, but also where parties were validly married by a non-Catholic minister and desire to be reconciled to the Church. The Holy Office, 11 May, 1892, again declared that "Catholics who marry before a Protestant minister incur excommunication, and that the bishop in virtue of the quinquennial faculties has power to absolve them as well as to delegate priests to grant the absolution".

The Third Council of Baltimore, no. 127, evidently makes this case of marriage before a Protestant minister an episcopal reserved case. Though the Bull *Apostolicae Sedis* was published in 1869, there was no unanimous understanding of all the cases that come under the first censure of the first series of excommunications. The declarations, however, which we have quoted make it clear beyond a reasonable doubt that a Catholic who contracts marriage before a Protestant minister incurs excommunication specially reserved to the Holy See. Bishops cannot of their own authority, but only by delegation of the Pope, absolve from it.

The confessor in our case, therefore, erred in taking the marriage before the Protestant minister as a bishop's reserved case. The decree of 13 July, 1916, facilitates the work of the pastors and missionaries to a great extent by granting to pastors the power to absolve from the diocesan reserved cases during the time of the Easter duty and to missionaries for the time of the mission; but that decree makes no new concessions concerning papal reserved cases.

What faculties of absolving from papal reserved cases our priests have, they must learn from the faculties granted them

in the respective dioceses in which they are stationed. The Bishops of the United States used to get extensive faculties of absolving from papal cases with the faculty of subdelegating most of them to the priests of their dioceses. As a rule, the Bishops in the faculties they communicated excepted this case of marriage before a Protestant minister, attempted second marriage while the first party is still alive, abortion, and perhaps a few other cases.

Though the confessor in our case was mistaken in the reason why he thought he had power to absolve, he had nevertheless a right to absolve the penitent by reason of a universal concession by the Holy See, 16 June, 1897, which grants to confessors the power to absolve from papal censures in all cases where it is hard for the penitent to wait for absolution until recourse can be had to the proper authority. Therefore, practically in all instances where the penitent is really well disposed and anxious to be absolved he can be directly absolved by any confessor from papal censures under condition that either the penitent himself or, as is usually done, the priest recurs to the Holy See by letter, without mentioning the real name, so as to get the *mandata*, that is, a penance which the authority may impose. Instead of writing to Rome, it was declared, 12 December, 1900, that it suffices to write to the bishop who has the delegated faculties from the Holy See. The recourse must be made within a month from the confession, under pain of relapsing into the censure, if the delay is due to neglect on the part of the penitent.

Finally, it may be noted that absolution from censures which a priest gives in confession has value only in the forum of conscience, which will be sufficient in censures incurred for a sin that has not become public, or, if public in the place where it was committed, is not public in the place where the party lives at present. If the crime by which the censure was incurred is public, the bishop has a right to demand the absolution *in foro externo* and to determine the manner in which the scandal is to be repaired. The ecclesiastical authority need not insist on an absolution *in foro externo* and may be satisfied with the absolution from the censure given in confession, provided it becomes public that the person has gone to confession, and by going to Holy Communion, Holy Mass,

etc., shows amendment. On the other hand, in small towns and villages great scandal may be given by individuals who have publicly defied the laws of the Church concerning marriage or other affairs of religion; so that a public reparation of scandal may become necessary even though the diocesan statutes do not insist on it.

FR. STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M.

"TWO-FACED" AND "THREE-FACED" MASSES.

Qu. Can you give any light on the curious custom referred to by Monsignor Walsh in his book *The Mass and Vestments of the Catholic Church*, page 115, where he talks of "Two-faced" and "Three-faced" Masses?

Resp. The author of the very useful work referred to by our correspondent, in the course of his explanation of "Solemn Mass", "Private Mass", etc. mentions by way of information some curious, long extinct customs associated with the phrases "Dry Mass", "Golden Mass", etc. Among these is the "Two-faced" or "Three-faced" Mass, which he describes as follows: "*Missa bifaciata, trifaciata* (two-faced, three-faced) was another subterfuge, a cunning device to meet the wants of a needy or avaricious clergy by only a partially multiple celebration to secure the additional honoraria, and yet escape the penalties of the Church inflicted on those who frequently celebrated on the same day. It was a Mass repeated two or three times to the Offertory for a variety of intentions, to be concluded finally with one Canon, Consecration, and Communion." Durandus, describing this custom,¹ adds, "Et in fine tot orationes dicunt quot officia missae inceperunt. Sed hoc tamquam detestabile reprobamus." The practice was condemned in several Councils and Synods in medieval times, for example, in the Synod of Prague and Torp, 1365-1367.²

THE "ORATE FRATRES."

Qu. I know that, in our day, it is customary to use the prescribed form "Orate Fratres" before the Secret Prayers of the Mass when

¹ *Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*, Lib. IV, Cap. I.

² See Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte*, Vol. VI, p. 719.

Mass is celebrated in a convent chapel or the chapel of a girls' school, the congregation being composed exclusively of "the devout female sex." I have recently learned that formerly it was the custom to use on such occasions the words "Orate Sorores." Can you give me any information on the subject?

Resp. O'Brien, in *A History of the Mass*, page 282, tells us that, "Although there should be none but females assisting at a priest's Mass, as is frequently the case in convents, still the form of salutation must not be changed from the masculine gender; nor must any addition whatever be made to it by reason of the attendance of the opposite sex. In ancient times, however, such a change used to be made in some places, for we find that the Sarum Rite used to say 'Orate fratres et sorores—Pray, brethren and sisters'; and the form may also be seen in a Missal of Cologne printed (?) in the year 1133."

IS HE A HERETIC OR A CATHOLIC?

Qu. A Catholic young lady is about to marry a young man baptized in the Catholic Church, but never instructed in his religion. He is willing to take the course of instructions prescribed by diocesan rule for a non-Catholic, but refuses to be considered a Catholic. What is the priest to do? Is he to apply for a dispensation *mixtae religionis*? Is the man to be considered a bad Catholic, or a heretic?

Resp. No dispensation is required, because there is no impediment *mixtae religionis*. The man is not a heretic in the sense of the marriage law, but is to be treated as a Catholic, and should by every means at the disposal of the priest be prevailed on to take up the practice of his religion. If all these means fail, and the man exhibit to the last a feeling of hostility toward the Church, the natural law prescribes that, although the marriage is not a mixed marriage, the usual *precautiones* or "promises" be exacted in regard to the religious education of the offspring and the non-interference with the religion of the Catholic party. Moreover, if the man has openly abjured the faith, although he has not formally joined a non-Catholic sect, the priest is obliged to obtain the consent of his bishop before assisting at the marriage.

HOLY COMMUNION FOR INVALIDS NOT FASTING.

Qu. How often during the week may a sick person receive Holy Communion, not fasting? I have read the decree on Holy Communion, but find no reference to the matter. Is there not a later decree granting the privilege to those who have been in bed for a long time?

Resp. The decree of 7 December 1906 granted the privilege "*ut infirmi qui jam a mense decumberent absque certa spe ut cito convalescant, de confessarii consilio Sanctissimam Eucharistiam sumere possint . . . etsi aliquid per modum potus antea sumpserint*". It determined further that this privilege may be enjoyed once or twice a week by those who live in houses where the Blessed Sacrament is kept, or where the Holy Sacrifice is offered in a domestic oratory, and once or twice a month by others. A decree of 6 March 1907 extended the privilege to those who, although they do not remain in bed all the time, are, in the judgment of their physicians, unable to observe the natural fast. In regard to the *potus*, or liquid nourishment, allowed, theologians warn us that we should avoid the extremes of too great severity and too great laxity of opinion and practice. In the case of invalids who do not come under either of these decrees the law of fasting must be observed, except in the matter of performing their Easter Duty. Lehmkuhl however adds that in these cases recourse may be had to the Holy See to obtain a personal privilege or dispensation.¹ It is important to note that, after next Pentecost, when the new Code of Canon Law comes into force, invalids may, "*de prudenti confessarii consilio*," receive Holy Communion even after having taken medicine or liquid refreshment, whether or not they reside in a dwelling where the Blessed Sacrament is kept.²

PROTESTATION OF INNOCENCE BY CONVICTED MURDERER BEFORE EXECUTION.

Qu. If a criminal, knowing that he has been justly condemned to capital punishment for murder, makes a statement, before his execution, declaring his innocence, does he tell a lie, or is he entirely

¹ *Theol. Moral.*, II, 221.

² Canon 858, n. 2.

within his rights in making the statement? Some maintain that he is guilty of a lie, because he makes a statement which he knows to be false. He makes it freely, without any solicitation from anyone, when he could just as freely have omitted it without in any way incriminating himself or implying his guilt. Others say that he does not lie, since he uses the privilege which all persons "in the hands of the law" enjoy, of denying their guilt and proclaiming their innocence. His statement, they maintain, means nothing more than this: I have not justly been *proved* guilty before the law.

Those who maintain that the statement is a lie, concede that an accused person may answer "Not guilty" when questioned in court and may use mental restriction to hide his guilt when questioned by persons who have no right to know the state of his conscience. But they deny this privilege to a person who freely proffers a statement of his innocence or is asked by those who have a right to know. Those who take the opposite view maintain that, no man being obliged to confess his guilt, a criminal may, at all times, while in the hands of the law, deny his guilt and proclaim his innocence, in the hope of getting a new trial or some other benefit, even when not asked to make any statement. Kindly give an opinion on this case.

Resp. The case in favor of the criminal being allowed to make a statement of his innocence when he knows that he is guilty seems to us to be well argued. The same right to use a *restrictio late mentalis* which is conceded to a culprit during his trial seems to us to extend to a voluntary *ante mortem* statement, so long as there is any hope of a new trial, a pardon, or a commutation of the death sentence. Besides, his surviving family and relatives have a right to the *bonum famae*, to the extent, at least, that they may not be compelled to admit his guilt.

NO DELEGATION REQUIRED FOR VALIDITY OF MARRIAGE.

Qu. It happens sometimes that parties from another parish or another diocese present themselves in this parish to be married. In order that they be validly married here, is any delegation necessary from their pastor to the pastor of this parish?

Resp. The decree *Ne temere* explicitly declares that marriages are valid when celebrated "coram parochio vel loci ordinario". This, we presume, is universally understood, and not open to any kind of question whatsoever. The

"liceity" of the marriage is a different matter. The decree ordains that, "as a general rule", the marriage should be contracted in the presence of the pastor of the bride, unless there be a good reason for contracting it elsewhere ("nisi aliqua justa causa excuset"). If neither of the parties has a domicile in the parish in which the ceremony takes place, and neither of them has, in the sense required by the law, resided there for a month, there is required for the "liceity" of the marriage the permission of the pastor or the ordinary of one of the parties, unless there is some grave necessity that may be considered as excusing from this formality, ("nisi gravis intercedat necessitas quae ab ea excuset"). This legislation is embodied in the new Code of Canon Law.¹

PRECEDENCE OF DEAN AND VICAR-GENERAL.

Qu. Kindly inform me if, in a diocese in which no synod has been held, where there are neither Canons nor a Chapter, a Dean takes precedence of a Vicar-General or a Domestic Prelate, both in church and social functions? How should a Dean be addressed?

Resp. So far as the Vicar-General is concerned, the case is clear. He has precedence over all the clergy of the diocese, including canons and other dignitaries of the cathedral church, unless they belong, and he does not belong, to the episcopal order. (*New Code of Canon Law*, Canon 370, n. 1.) When it is question of a Domestic Prelate, since the Vicar-General is, during his term of office, a titular Protontary Apostolic, he takes precedence over others who are styled *Monsignori*. The Dean, or Vicar-Forane, has precedence over the pastors and other priests of his own district. (Can. 450, n. 2.) In social functions the same order of precedence would hold. Canonists, speaking of the preëminence of the Vicar-General, declare that he precedes all other dignitaries of the diocese, except the bishop, "publice ac privatim in omnibus actis."² There is no general statute conferring a special mode of address on the Dean. By local custom in most English-speaking countries he is addressed as "Very Reverend".

¹ Canon 1097.

² Wernz, *Jus Decretalium*, II, 805.

CONSECRATION OF CHALICE.

Qu. I ordered a chalice from a firm in an episcopal city and, for the sake of convenience, had the dealer procure its consecration before sending it to me. I paid for the chalice after receiving it. Did it thereby lose its consecration?

Does a chalice lose its consecration if the cup is bent somewhat out of shape so as to form a kind of beak?

Resp. A consecrated chalice is a case of "*res temporalis antecedenter annexa spirituali*," and, as moralists teach,¹ objects of this kind may be bought or sold, provided the price is not increased on account of the blessing or consecration. Positive ecclesiastical law, however, forbids selling or exposing for sale, rosaries, medals, etc. already blessed, but does not include the case of a chalice previously ordered but paid for after having been consecrated.

We think that, in the second case mentioned, there may be the obligation to have the chalice repaired and reconsecrated. The obligation certainly exists if the deformation is such that there is danger of the Sacred Species being spilled. If the injury to the cup is such that the chalice can no longer be used for the Holy Sacrifice, it has lost its consecration.

PRIEST ASSISTING AT REMARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE.

Qu. May I ask that, when you have the time and inclination, you will give the reasons underlying your response to the query "Remarriage after Divorce" on page 81 of your July number. The REVIEW of December 1915 gives the same answer but gives no reasons.

I am unable to see why the priest could not have acted in the circumstances noted. Judges, priests, and ministers of any denomination have direct authority from the State to solemnize marriage. No particular form of ceremony is requested except that the parties to be married must, in the presence of the person authorized by the State, say that they take each other to be husband and wife. The priest here is acting purely as a civil servant of the State and not in his religious capacity at all. Because a man is a Catholic priest is no reason why he cannot perform civil functions authorized by the State. It might be that the priest, as the only fit man in the village, is the Justice of the Peace. He surely could not refuse to perform

¹ Cf. Noldin, II, 185, 4.

the duties which his position authorizes him to perform because he is also a priest.

It seems to me that in the case under discussion the priest, after explaining to the parties that they were already married, and that he, as a priest, could not marry them again, that the State required that a civil ceremony should take place, and that he had been authorized by the State to perform that civil ceremony, should proceed with it. Unless the priest can do this, then it is impossible to separate his priestly character from his civil character.

I would be very appreciative if some time you will give further attention to this subject.

Resp. We did not mean to convey the impression that the priest in this case was in any way incapable of fulfilling the requirements of the civil law in regard to remarriage after divorce. Moreover, there is no law of the Church so far as we know that would oblige him to refuse to act, provided that, as our correspondent advises, he explain to the parties the exact nature of the transaction and the reason for it. What we had in mind was rather the danger that an erroneous public opinion may be established, the opinion, namely, that the Sacrament of Matrimony was repeated. There are, as our correspondent doubtless knows, many non-Catholics who are not quite convinced that the Catholic Church maintains in practice the indissolubility of the marriage bond. They cite instances, as they think, to the contrary, and we have difficulty in getting them to understand the law and its application in such cases. It would not be wise, we thought, to adopt as a general policy a procedure that might add to the misunderstanding, although, we repeat, we cannot go so far as to find fault with a priest who in a particular instance would accede to the wishes of the parties and witness the renewal of the matrimonial consent, as is required by civil law.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE CHURCH AND SCIENCE. By Sir Bertram O. A. Windle, M. A., M. D., etc., President of the University College, Dublin. Catholic Truth Society, London; B. Herder, St. Louis. 1917. Pp. 415.

It is a coincidence, worthy alike of notice and of commendation, that the two writers who are in large measure devoting themselves to clearing up the field upon which the protagonists of the physical sciences on the one hand and the champions of faith on the other meet—sometimes for mutual aid, though oftenest for fierce conflict—should both be laymen. We refer of course to Dr. James J. Walsh in this country, and to Professor Windle in Ireland and England; the former the well known author of *The Popes and Science* and *Catholic Churchmen in Science*, and the latter the author of the volume before us and of several other similar productions. The fact that both these writers are thoroughly equipped in the medical and allied sciences entitles them to a respectful hearing in scientific circles, while their established reputation as fully informed as well as loyal Catholics accredits their judgment and utterances on matters touching the doctrines of the Church.

It is in the borderland between the domains of science and of faith that the conflicts between the defenders of each of these territories take place. It is a threadworn truism that there is and can be no conflict between science and faith; but it is an equally familiar fact that between their respective representatives hostilities seem never entirely to die down. The first chapter of Genesis is one of those fields which fairly bristles with vexed and vexing problems. The books that have been written to solve these difficulties would fill a library, and the end is not yet. Neither should there, nor can there, be an end of this sort of apology. Genuine science must be progressive, and plausible theories will always spring up more or less harmonious or discordant with the truths of faith and the speculations of theologians. So it is natural that the bearings of reason and faith will never cease to demand restatement and readjustment. Notwithstanding therefore the copious already existing literature on this subject, there is ample room and justification for a work such as Dr. Windle has given us.

The work is at once comprehensive of the range of subject matter and relatively thorough in details, as well as felicitous in method and style. It surveys the universe of natural phenomena, including herein the constitution of matter, viewed both from a physico-

chemical and a philosophical standpoint. The latest scientific theories concerning the ether and the electronic construction of the atom, no less than the venerable philosophy of matter and form, are duly weighed and measured. The universe as a totality, its origin, its laws; the leading facts and theories of geology; "the creative days"; the archeological and prehistorical data regarding primitive man; the speculations as to the age of the earth and of man; the manifold problems touching the nature and origin of life; the unceasing controversies of evolutionism in its various forms; and lastly the problems centering on the nature and origin of man—upon all these and their implied questions Dr. Windle has the latest, even if not the last, word to say.

While what he says will no doubt be fairly familiar to students who are already somewhat versed in these problems, those who are not so well informed will find here a large accumulation of most interesting and important facts and theories, set forth with judicious discrimination. The scientific data are sifted sufficiently to meet the needs of this class of readers. The author therefore avoids, as far as is consistent with the character of the work, technicalities and abstrusities. The style is never obscure. It is always interesting and in the better sense of the term popular. The book is one that meets the needs, and, it is to be hoped, the demands of our young men and women, especially those who are attending non-Catholic institutions, or who for one reason or another require a prophylactic or an antidote to the insidious virus which pervades much of the literature of so-called popular science. Such minds need the continual confirmation of their faith from the rational side. They need something more than the bald statement that science cannot conflict with faith. They require the detailed exposition of those theories which are claimed, if not by science at least by the camp-followers of science, to impugn the doctrines of revealed religion. One can hardly find a non-Catholic book dealing with ethnology, anthropology, psychology, or sociology, in which, for instance, the animal origin of man is not taken for granted, either as proved, or as so eminently probable as to render the negative proposition undeserving of consideration. The *audi alteram partem* is given no consideration by these purveyors of popular science—or rather inscience. That a few genuine scientists like Mivart, Dwight, and Wallace, have strenuously argued against the bestial origin of, at least, the human soul, counts for comparatively little with the general trend of what passes for "scientific" teaching. With Catholic students, however, it should count for much, and it is well for them to have so convenient and so interesting a summing up of the issues as the present volume offers them.

SOLUTION OF THE GREAT PROBLEM. Translated by E. Leahy from the French of Abbé Delloue, Military Chaplain at Soissons (Past Student of l'Ecole Polytechnique). From the second revised French edition. Frederick Pustet Co., New York and Cincinnati. 1917. Pp. 279.

The multiplication of manuals of Christian apology does not necessarily imply that the older predecessors have outlived their time or have become in any way unserviceable in their particular relations. As Father O'Neill, S. J., observes in his preface to the present volume, "There are a few (very few) books good for everybody; there will always be the real demand, the real place, for the special book for the special reader." The "great problem" here discussed is by no means new, save in the sense in which the problem of human destiny is new to every soul that recurs to it seriously after having for a time set it aside. To the truly reflective mind the problem of Eternity can never be wholly old. Irrespective of its age, however, the holding of its true solution before the mind is the only course for a sensible man to adopt. From this standpoint alone the present volume would be eminently worth while. In addition to this immediately practical service the book presents a line of argument possessing an intellectual cogency that should make the work a valuable auxiliary of Christian defence and propaganda.

Having stated "the great problem" to be the fate of the soul's hereafter, the author outlines the various solutions that have been proposed, particularly by materialism and by pantheism. He then unfolds in detail the Christian solution, beginning with the proofs, popular, scientific, and philosophical, for the existence of God and the immortality of the soul. He next establishes the (moral) necessity of a revelation, examines in turn the several systems that claim to have received a Divine message—Judaism, Mahomedanism, and Christianity. The two former are shown to be inadequate. The latter alone is consistent throughout and rationally as well as practically sufficient. Out of the various Christian systems Catholicism stands apart as proposing the sole solution of the problem that satisfies the demands of reason.

The line of argument is obviously the *demonstratio Catholico-Christiana* familiar to every well instructed Catholic. As such the book covers well trodden ground. Nevertheless, since the argument is not only logically conclusive, but well illustrated and permeated by a concrete practical spirit, the work will serve a useful purpose both by confirming the Catholic mind in faith and zeal and by guiding the inquiring non-Catholic soul in its gropings toward the light.

LUTHER. By Hartmann Grisar, S. J., Professor at the University of Innsbruck. Vol. VI. Authorized translation by E. M. Lamond. Edited by Luigi Cappadelta. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. 1917. Pp. 551.

Finis coronat opus. A worthy completion indeed of Father Grisar's colossal work is this crowning volume. The lines that have gradually given shape and character to the monument have not terminated with the shaft. They run up to their determined ending in the topmost apex. Those lines were explicitly drawn when in the opening paragraph of the initial volume the author made known his purpose to compose not simply an historical but likewise a psychological picture of Luther's personality, a personality which in so many respects still remains an enigma. The work was therefore to be as accurate as possible a delineation of Luther's character as seen both from within and in the outer history of his life, from his childhood to his death. Needless to say, this purpose has been faithfully adhered to, as has been noted when from time to time in these pages the several stages of the work's development have been discussed, and as we may now proceed to indicate in regard to the latest, the crowning portion of the work.

In the immediately preceding volume (V), Luther's attitude toward social life and education formed the concluding topic. The subject is finished in the opening sections of the present volume. Here Luther's activities in regard to elementary and higher education, his attitude toward social beneficence, poor relief, secular avocations, and certain economic problems including usury, interest, investments, and so on, are discussed *seriatim*. Were our spatial limits less restricted it might be worth while dwelling here on the author's treatment of Luther's words and deeds respecting these important topics. We can find room for but one typical example.

In the review of Von Treitschke's *Politics* in our August number, this enthusiastic advocate of Luther was quoted as justifying—quite jauntily, we might add—the secularization of the Church's goods in the sixteenth century, on the ground that “it relieved the Church of worldly possessions contradictory to its real spirit, while at the same time it furthered the nation's economic prosperity.” It is hard to take Von Treitschke seriously when he attributes so disinterested a motive either to Luther or to his political disciples. One might as plausibly assign such a motive to the recent robbers of the Church in Mexico. When, however, Von Treitschke asserts that the spoliation of the Church in the sixteenth century “furthered the nation's economic prosperity,” he can scarcely be acquitted either of conscious prevarication or unpardonable ignorance. The German

nation, as such, prospered by the spoliation in question no more than did subsequently the English by Henry's no less wanton robberies; or the French nation of our own day by the late secularization of the properties belonging to the various congregations. For the rest, here is what Father Grisar finds to be the verdict of contemporary witnesses. The incredible squandering of the Church's property he shows to be proved by the official papers; it is pilloried by the professors of the University of Rostock; it is also clear from the minutes of the Visitations of Wesenberg in 1568 and of the Palatinate in 1556, which bewail "the sin against the property set aside for God and His Church." And again: "The present owners have dealt with the Church property a thousand times worse than the Papists; they make no conscience of selling it, mortgaging it, and giving it away." Princes belonging to the new faith also raised their voices in protest; for instance, Duke Barnim XI in 1540, Elector Joachim II of Brandenburg in 1540, and Elector Johann George in 1573. But the sovereigns were unable to restrain their rapacious nobles. "The great Lords," the preacher Erasmus wrote of the Mansfield district in 1555, "seek to appropriate to themselves the feudal rights and dues of the clergy and allow their officials and justices to take forcible action. . . . The revenues of the Church are spent in making roads and bridges [doubtless a public benefit] and giving banquets and are lent from hand to hand without hypothecary security. The Calvinist, Anton Praetorius, and many others, not to mention Catholic contemporaries, speak in similar strain" (p. 61).

Other flagrant economic and social evils resulting directly from the new teaching are quoted by Father Grisar from contemporary authorities; but enough has been said above to prove that the spoliation of Church property did not contribute to Germany's national prosperity.

The more immediately pertinent contributions to the psychology of Luther are comprised in the next two chapters of the volume. Here the darker side of Luther's inner life is laid bare. His early sufferings, bodily and mental; the manifold and multiform perturbations which Luther was wont to comprise under the elastic term "tentationes," the intercourse which he so frequently asserted he had with the devil; his claims to private revelations—these and a mass of allied abnormalities, more or less repulsive, are described partly in Luther's own words, partly in those of his associates. Whether Luther was or was not subject to hallucinations, it is practically impossible to determine. Expert authorities are cited for each side of the question.

That he was subject to more or less morbid nervous disturbances during both his monastic and his subsequent career is a well known and a generally admitted fact. That the nervous disorders, moreover, were in part caused and certainly aggravated by his excessive mental labors, his studies, writing, preaching, and his habitually agitated existence, is no less certain and acknowledged. On the other hand, when all due allowance has been made for temperamental nervosity and for the cerebral perturbations brought on by excessive intellectual strain, a prominent, if not the principal, cause of his morbid conditions was remorse of conscience.

This is no *a priori* diagnosis, but an inevitable inference from the character of the phenomena and from Luther's own avowals. The frequently recurrent fears, despairs, horrible temptations which were unintelligible to minds so experienced in these matters as Staupitz, Cajetan, and others—all these are conditions of Luther's inner life that have been described over and over again both by himself and by all his biographers. Father Grisar devotes not a little space to these perturbations. To some readers indeed it will seem the heaping up of these morbidities goes beyond measure, seeing especially that many of the phenomena had been described in the preceding volume. On the other hand, having undertaken to analyze the psychology, the soul-life, of Luther, it was important, perhaps imperative, to leave no phase of the relevant phenomena, however repellent to sensitive nerves, unmentioned.

One great difficulty, if not the greatest, in the way to an accurate biography of this kind, is the fact that the material has largely to be derived from the hero's narrations concerning himself—his inner as well as outer experience. It is well known that Luther as he advanced in years was habitually given to garrulous reminiscences. Like many another story-teller he had no hesitation in dealing liberally with past events, in exaggerating, understating, distorting his experiences according as the adornment of the tale suggested. In the case of Luther his well known easy doctrine on lying rendered this plastic manipulation of materials for the sake of art all the more likely to occur. It is chiefly because many of his biographers fail to recognize and to discount this disposition, conscious or unconscious, to falsify, that the legends which grew out of his correspondence, his sermons, and largely from that queer farrago of grossness, geniality, and shrewd worldly wisdom, *The Table-Talk*, have been handed down even to our own time and are still propagated by the popular encyclopedias and ephemeral literature. In view of these legendary stories the following avowal of Hausrath, Luther's latest non-Catholic biographer, may be worth citing. "Not only have the dates been altered," says Hausrath, "of Luther's

later statements concerning his first public appearance, but even the facts. No sooner does the elderly man begin to tell his tale than the past becomes as soft as wax in his hands. The same words are placed on the lips, now of this, now of that, friend or foe. The opponents of his riper years are depicted as his persecutors even in his youth. Albert of Mayence had never acted otherwise toward him than as a liar and deceiver. Even previous to the Worms visit he had sought to annul his safe-conduct. . . . Of Tetzels he now asserts that unless Duke Frederick had pleaded for him to the Emperor Max, he would have been put in a sack and drowned in the Inn on account of his dissolute life. . . . The same holds good of the [equally untrue] statement that Tetzels had sold indulgences for sins yet to be committed. . . . It is also an exaggeration of his old age when Luther asserts that, in his youth, the Bible had been a closed book to all. . . . To the Old Reformer almost everything in the monastery appears in the blackest of hues" (p. 188). Luther, as everyone knows, was a past master in the art of scurrility, but he surpassed himself when in his fits of Satanic fury against Pope and monk he vents himself of torrents of the vilest calumnies couched in language which is almost too indecent to print.

When one considers the difficulty of getting at the real inner life of Luther, on account of the frequent liberties he takes with facts, one cannot help admiring the patient research, the careful sifting, but more still the impartial justice exercised by the present biographer in contrast with so many others who have dealt with the same subject from an *a priori* point of view. Having treated explicitly of Luther's soul life, Father Grisar proceeds to consider some of the more immediate consequences or rather the implicit effects of Doctor Martin's teaching. He shows from abundant evidence how quickly Luther's doctrine of freedom of conscience was converted into the most violent spirit of autocratic intolerance of any and every belief that did not coincide with his own, an intolerance which extended primarily, though not exclusively, toward the Church and the Pope, and which effectuated in the doctrine of bloody persecution. Among Luther's caricatures of the Pope is included one depicting the "well-deserved reward of the Most Satanic Pope and his Cardinals." Here the Pope is seen on the gallows with three Cardinals; their tongues, which have been torn out by the root, are nailed to the gibbet and devils are scurrying off with their souls. The picture is embellished with the following doggerel:

"Did Pope and Card'nal here below,
Their due reward receive
Then would their tongues to gibbets cleave
As our draughtsman's lines do show" (p. 246).

This is but one sample out of a goodly number given by Father Grisar which go to show how far the great Reformer was from being the apostle of religious liberty he is generally declared to have been by most of his uninformed or prejudiced biographers. Occasionally, however, Protestant writers are to be found who rise above such party prejudice. Walter Köhler, for instance, in his *Reformation und Ketzerprozess* as quoted by Father Grisar, declares that in "Luther's case it is impossible to speak of liberty of conscience or religious freedom." "The death penalty for heresy rested on the highest Lutheran authority." "It is certain that Luther would have agreed to the execution of Servetus; heresy as heresy is, according to him, deserving of death." "When the preaching of the Word proved ineffectual against the heretics," Luther had recourse to the secular authorities.

It is futile to attempt to excuse the Reformer's reiterated appeal to these authorities on the ground that the heresies, such as those of the Anabaptists, were revolutionary politically and destructive socially. For, as another Protestant authority, Wappler, cited by Father Grisar, declares, "Even contempt of the outward Word, carelessness about going to church and contempt of Scripture—in this instance contempt for the Bible as interpreted by Luther—was now regarded as 'rank blasphemy' which it was the duty of the authorities to punish as such. To such lengths had the vaunted freedom of the Gospel now gone" (p. 267).

If legend has been busy with the deeds and the character of Luther, the materials for the fictions lay ready to hand in the phantasies that came from the brain and lips of the hero himself and of his friends and admirers. It was to be expected that the mythic propensity would find a splendid chance afforded by the circumstances of Luther's death and burial; only that here the enemies of the Reformer more than his disciples availed themselves of the unique opportunity. Luther was dead, and only a few near friends, excepting the apothecary, had witnessed his passing. Hence it is not surprising that hardly twenty years had elapsed before the report that Luther had committed suicide began to be spread abroad, the report being alleged to have arisen from the testimony of a servant. That critical and impartial biographer of Luther, Paulus, quotes from a book on the marks of the Church, written by the Italian Oratorian, Thomas Brozjus, and printed in Rome in 1591, the following statement: "Luther, after having supped heartily that evening and gone to bed quite content, died the same night by suffocation. I hear that it has recently been discovered through the confession of a witness, who was then his servant and who came over to us in late years, that Luther brought himself to a miserable end by hanging; but that

all the inmates of the house who knew of the incident were bound under oath not to divulge the matter, for the honor of the Evangel, as it was said " (p. 381).

Needless to say, Father Grisar hunts down the legend and gives the genuine facts of the case as they are narrated by the apothecary, Johann Landau, who administered to Luther on the latter's deathbed, and who, being a Catholic, a convert, and a nephew of the convert polemicist Wicel, may be considered an unbiased witness. "The apothecary [he speaks of himself in the third person] was awakened at the third hour after midnight. . . . When he arrived he said to the doctors: 'He is quite dead. Of what use can an injection be?' However, at the demand of the physicians present he administered the injection, till they saw that all was useless. The two physicians disputed together as to the cause of death. The doctor said it was a fit of apoplexy, for the mouth was drawn down and the whole of the right side was discolored. The master, on the other hand, thought it incredible that so holy a man could have been thus stricken down by the hand of God, and thought it was rather the result of a suffocating catarrh and that death was due to choking. . . . Jonas, who was seated at the head of the bed, wept aloud and wrung his hands. When asked whether Luther had complained of any pain the evening before, he replied: 'Dear me, no, he was more cheerful yesterday than he had been for many a day. O God Almighty, O God Almighty, etc.' " "By this Jonas," adds Father Grisar, "did not mean to deny the fit of heart oppression that had occurred the day before, since he himself reports it to the Elector; but, distracted by grief as he was, he probably thought only of the good spirits Luther had been in that evening and of the contrast with the dead body lying before him." Or he may not have regarded Luther's more or less frequent heart oppression as "pain" (p. 380).

If the enemies of Luther were quick to invent all sorts of horrors concerning his death and the fate of his body and soul, it should be remembered that he was being paid back by the things he had done unto others. It is well known, as Father Grisar points out, that Luther had drawn up a list of the persecutors of his Evangel, who, in his own day, had been snatched away by sudden death. The list served him on occasions in his sermons and writings. Among the fearsome tales of death which our author gathers from the *Table-Talk* was that, for instance, of Mutian, the humanist, "who, refusing to become a Lutheran, fell from poverty into despair and poisoned himself; of the Archbishop of Treves, Richard of Greiffenklau, 'who was bodily carried off to hell by the devil'; of the Catholic preacher, Urban of Kunewalde, who 'having fallen away from the Evangel' was 'struck by a thunderbolt' in the church and then

again by a flash of lightning that passed through his body from head to foot, because he had asked heaven for a sign to prove that he was right', etc. 'All these perished miserably,' he says, 'like senseless swine. And so it will happen with the others'" (p. 383).

It might be interesting to set forth Father Grisar's account of the posthumous fame of Luther—the trend of the panegyrics, epitaphs, medals; or the verdicts passed upon him by his friends and enemies. A vast amount of material important for a just estimate of Luther's character and influence is here enmassed. But we must hasten to the close of this notice, pausing only to call attention to a particularly valuable feature of the volume, namely, the list which is found amongst other important additions and annotations in the Appendix, of Luther's writings, arranged chronologically and in coördination with the leading events of the times. Nothing will serve better to give one an idea of Luther's tremendous energy and restless activity than this copious catalogue of his writings. Nor less forcefully does the elenchus suggest the immense labor of research and critical sifting and resifting of materials which the present monumental biography of so many-sided and intricate a personality as Luther's must have entailed. There will probably be other future biographies of Luther, but there will be none whose authors can afford to pass by the present comprehensive, judicious, and unprejudiced study of the first Protestant Reformer.

THE SUMMA THEOLOGICA OF ST. THOMAS AQUINAS. Part II (Second Part). Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. First Number (QQ. I—XLVI). Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. vi—596.

While the *Summa* as a whole reveals the comprehensiveness of the mind of St. Thomas, the several parts manifest each in its way some more or less special characteristic of his analytical insight and acumen. Thus the First Part reflects his wonderful logical power of pursuing to their simplest constituent notes the highly abstract concepts whereby the human mind seeks to grasp the nature of the Deity, Creation and Providence. The Second Part, and particularly the *Secunda Secundae*, evidence especially his critical insight into the psychology of the moral life. It is the first forty-six questions of the latter Part of the *opus magnum* that are presented in translation by the above volume. These questions cover the Virtues of Faith, Hope and Charity, the Gifts of the Holy Ghost allied to these virtues, and the vices opposed both to the Virtues and the Gifts. The volume next in order will treat of the Cardinal Virtues on the same lines. The average mind, even though other-

wise well endowed and informed, hardly realizes the wealth of thought implicit in the idea of the "Virtues" until it has looked into them with the experienced eye of the Angelic Doctor, who above all theologians practised what he preached, and analyzed not only the traditional theology and philosophy of the Church, but wrote out of the abundance of his own spiritual experience. Happily, the English translation is so well done that the Angelical's thought seems to pass with undiminished light from the original into its acquired medium. Even though the reader be familiar with the lucid Latin of St. Thomas, the English version has a power of its own, in that it furnishes at once the linguistic imagery in which after all, unless he be wont "to think in Latin"—a habit acquired by the minority—he is accustomed to perform the mental functions which accompany his reflective processes and the spontaneous acts of assimilation. The vernacular imagery is always the easiest, because the most habitual, instrument of knowledge, and while easiness is not the most valuable ally of the mind or body, it is a welcome auxiliary or condition when the essential processes are themselves sufficiently laborious, which is the case with pursuits metaphysical and theological.

SERMON NOTES. By the late Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson. Edited by the Rev. O. O. Martindale, S. J. First Series: Anglican. Longmans, Green & Co., New York and London. 1917. Pp. viii—145.

It was to be expected that so original a personality as Robert Hugh Benson would stamp itself no less characteristically on the outlines of his productions than upon the finished embodiment. Of course those who retain the recollection of his striking manner in the pulpit will be able to infuse into these *Notes* something of the spirit and life that marked the actual delivery of the completed discourses. Even those, however, who never had that privilege, will easily recognize the man as they have learned to know him through his other literary productions. The master's touch of Raphael stands out as unmistakably in the cartoons as it does in the Dresden Madonna. And those who know Benson by his novels or at least by his volumes of sermons and essays will see him just as surely in these *Sermon Notes*. The latter therefore possess a psychological value and that not merely as an added illustration of a singular personality but as another demonstration of his religious consciousness and development. For, as Father Martindale observes, though the sermons here sketched are in the main devotional rather than dogmatic—and indeed not entirely free from an occasional doctrinal inaccuracy—nevertheless "the substantial scheme of Benson's theol-

ogy can be watched in them growing firm and compact." Although the *Notes* are in reality *outlines*, the latter are, like those left us by Faber, so clear cut and so suggestive that they at once lend themselves to the preacher's demands, while for purposes of meditation one will go far before finding "points" more pointed.

THOMAS MAURIOE MULRY. By Thomas F. Meehan. The Encyclopedia Press, New York. 1917. Pp. 240.

It is very much to be regretted that this volume has been published as a biography of one of the greatest Catholic laymen of our century. It is practically a reproduction of the Memorial number of the St. Vincent de Paul Quarterly of May 1916. In fact a very large amount of that material is reproduced verbatim. The author of this volume took that liberty without the consent of the editors of the Quarterly. His note referring to the Quarterly is no index of the extent of his obligation to it. In addition to the material indicated the author prints a few of Mr. Mulry's papers, each of which was easily accessible otherwise.

The author of this life appears to have made no effort to examine the letters of Mr. Mulry or to obtain from his closest friends, adequate insight into his inner life. There is no indication that the original materials for a biography were assembled. There is no evidence anywhere in the volume that the author himself made any effort to give to the world an adequate interpretation of a wonderful man. The volume before us is disappointing to the last degree. The biography of Mr. Mulry remains to be written. W. J. K.

Literary Chat.

Amongst the subjects discussed by St. Thomas in the *Secunda Secundae*, the English translation whereof is noticed in the present number, is that of War. The "question" in which the topic is handled contains four articles. The first of these deals with the licitness of war under certain conditions. The second considers the question "whether it is lawful for clerics and bishops to fight." The answer shows how far away modern governments have got not only from the negative decision laid down by this prince of ethicists, but from the moral foundations upon which that decision is based.

After answering the questions in the negative, St. Thomas gives his reasons as follows: "*I answer that* several things are requisite for the good of a human society; and a number of things are done better and quicker by a number of persons than by one . . . while certain occupations are so inconsistent with one another that they cannot be fittingly exercised at the same time; wherefore those who are deputed to important duties are forbidden to occupy themselves with things of small importance." And he illustrates this by the Roman law which forbade "soldiers who are deputed to warlike pursuits to engage in commerce."

The principles here laid down are so general that the most up-to-date moralist would probably level at them a *transeat*. It is when we regard the application of them to the question at issue that we are struck by the antipodal distance between the moral standards of the thirteenth and the twentieth century. St. Thomas advances two reasons why "warlike pursuits are altogether incompatible with the duties of a bishop and of a cleric." The first is a general one, "to wit, warlike pursuits are full of unrest, so that they hinder the mind very much from the contemplation of Divine things, the praise of God, and prayers for the people, which belong to the duties of a cleric. Wherefore, just as commercial enterprises are forbidden to clerics, because they unsettle the mind too much, so too are warlike pursuits, according to 2 Tim. 2:4: 'No man being a soldier of God, entangleth himself with secular business.'" *O tempora, O mores.*

But now for the second reason, which is special, "to wit, because, all the clerical Orders are directed to the ministry of the altar, on which the Passion of Christ is represented sacramentally, according to 1 Cor. 11: 26: 'As often as you shall eat this bread and drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord, until He come.' Wherefore it is unbecoming for them to slay or shed blood, and it is more befitting that they should be ready to shed their own blood for Christ, so as to imitate in deed what they portray in their ministry. For this reason it has been decreed that those who shed even without sin, become irregular. Now no man who has a certain duty to perform can lawfully do that which renders him unfit for that duty. Wherefore it is unlawful," and so on.

It goes of course without saying that the illicitness of clerics going a-warring is derived from the positive ecclesiastical law and consequently falls within the Church's power of dispensation, a power that is evidently being exercised by the Church in the present European condition of the clergy. But the situation shows the altered ethics that are in control to-day in the land where St. Thomas penned the article from which the above passages are cited.

As poet, Charles Warren Stoddard is much less known than as writer of exquisite, opalescent prose. Yet his verse ranks very high and possesses genuinely lyrical qualities. The judiciously made collection of his scattered rhymes, for which we are indebted to the laborious efforts of Miss Colbrith, will be welcomed by all lovers of the inspired lay. (*Poems of Charles Warren Stoddard, Poet of the South Seas.* Collected by Ina Colbrith. John Lane Co., New York.). A process of severe weeding has left in these pages only what is of real merit. Music and color constitute the main charm of the poems. A view of wistful sadness runs through them, and stamps them with the universally recognized hallmark of true art. Nature, in its various moods, especially in its grander aspects, is the chief theme; but the deeper questionings of the soul, also find an echo and a hopeful answer in his verse. His is not the solemn harp, but the melodious lyre; nor is his the inspiring message of the seer, but the heartfelt song that soothes the tearful soul and fans to brighter flame the smoldering embers of hope. Gladness and joy will these tuneful verses bring, as the first flowers of spring.

If any name deserves to be enshrined in the hearts of Americans, particularly Catholics, it is that of Christopher Columbus, who braved the perils of the deep to draw out of obscurity an unknown world. Who would dare to say that this bold navigator and dreamer of magnificent dreams come true, is known as he should be known? In most cases the world is generous to its dead heroes; but to Columbus it still owes a great debt which it is very tardy in paying. *Christopher Columbus in Poetry, History and Art* (By Sara Agnes Ryan. The Mayer & Miller Co., Chicago.) is a contribution toward the discharge of this debt of honor. It is a collection of gems gathered from a wide range of sources and woven into a crown for the great discoverer.

All the phases of the daring explorer's life are covered, and artistic illustrations visualize the decisive moments in his eventful career. The book is, evidently, a labor of love and will furnish material and inspiration to anyone called upon to hold forth on the noble character or the tremendous venture of the Discoverer of the New World.

Most of what men have written concerning the great war will be forgotten when peace shall have been restored to the weary world. Among the few things that will survive are the utterances of Cardinal Mercier, inspired by a burning indignation and an unquenchable zeal for justice. Gathered into one volume, they create a powerful impression and must be taken into account by any future historian of the war. (*Per Crucem ad Lucem*. Bloud & Gay, Paris.) We have here one of the rare instances where anger assumes the splendid dimensions of heroic virtue. From these pages the noble, gaunt figure of the courageous Cardinal looms forth in towering grandeur. An irresistible logic, a vehement, artless eloquence, and a superb moral earnestness flash forth in every line.

The Catholics of France have given ample evidence of practical patriotism in the hour of their country's need and have liberally poured out their resources of men and wealth. Knowing the forgetfulness of the world, not in any spirit of boastfulness, they have seen fit to preserve in print the record of their patriotism (Paul Delay, *Les Catholiques au Service de la France*. Georges Goyau, *L'Eglise de France durant la Guerre*. Bloud & Gay, Paris.). May these two volumes keep fresh in the heart of France the memory of the heroic patriotism and the noble sacrifices of the Catholics of France!

The spirit of poetry is widely diffused and it flowers not only on the Olympian heights, but also in lowly valleys and hidden nooks. These humbler blossoms are often dearer to the heart than those of more luxurious growth and dazzling beauty. *A Scallop Shell of Quiet* (By B. H. Blackwell. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.) is a wreath of flowers, culled in the meadows and the fields. They are laden with a fragrance that gladdens the heart and lightens the daily toil. Coming from the pens of four gifted women authors, strangers as yet to fame, but well worthy of fair renown, they present the womanly view of things and deal with topics taken from woman's sphere of life. No militant note of rebellion or defiance jars on our ear as we listen to these sweet strains. The keynotes to which they are attuned are devotion to duty and the spirit of service.

"The Mystical Knowledge of God" is made so simple and interesting by Dom Savinien Louismet, O.S.B., in a little booklet bearing that title, that a reader of good will can hardly fail to be drawn to practice it and to experience the practice growing into him. It is an easy "essay in the art of knowing and loving the Divine Majesty," as the subtitle describes it. *Amor facit viam brevem*, and that is the method the author points out as the way to the end—the intimate and abiding experiential knowledge of God. The wee volume can be had in this country from P. J. Kenedy & Sons (New York).

The Messrs. Kenedy likewise issue *The Little Pilgrims to Our Lady of Lourdes*, by Mrs. Francis Blundell (M. E. Francis), a charming series of chapters telling the story of Bernadette Soubirous and her touching relations to Notre Dame de Lourdes. There are thirty-one stages in the narrative, arranged for a full month of days of pilgrimage to Our Lady of the Cave at Massabielle. The book is offered in thanksgiving for the recovery from a serious illness of the author's little boy. It is also meant to be a help to make spiritual pilgrimages to Our Lady at her favorite grotto, to beg her intercession for suffering humanity whose ills are greater even than those of the poor sufferers that seek health in the miraculous waters.

The latest accession to the Angelus Series is entitled *Leaves of Gold*, and consists of excerpts from the Books of Proverbs, Wisdom, and Ecclesiasticus. Like its fellows in the series it is a winsome little volume and, while delighting its readers with its cheery face and form, should serve to lead them to the primal fountains whence it has drawn its own waters of wisdom (Benziger Bros., New York).

An Unwilling Traveler, by Mary E. Donovan, is the story of Anne, a little girl who, having lost her parents in her early years, is brought up with some kind "uncles" and "aunts" in the country. Here, while gathering bits of rural experience, she develops a sturdy character which stands to her when she is kidnapped and carried off to the Isle of Wight, at the instigation of a wealthy old gentleman who tries to persuade her that she is his grandchild, and seeks to lavish on her his fortune. She steadily rejects his proposals, knowing that she bears no such relation to him. Happily, however, she falls heir to another fortune, the accumulated residue of her father's estate, who had been an English physician. Anne, though an "unwilling traveler," profits by her journeyings in many ways. It is an interesting story, healthy, and well told. A good book to put in the hands of girls from ten to twelve (B. Herder, St. Louis).

Of the manifold appeals that come to us from the lands laid waste by the War none is more heartrending than the cry from Lithuania. Divided between Russia and Germany the country has been pillaged and devastated beyond all description. Its able-bodied men have been drafted into the opposing armies and slaughtered by uncounted thousands, while its women and children have been deprived of shelter and scattered broadcast throughout the country. The number of victims is said "to be more than a million and the havoc caused by the invaders amounts to several billions of dollars." The authority for this statement is number nine of *A Plea for the Lithuanians*, a monthly review published by the Lithuanian Information Bureau. The relief work of which it is the organ is endorsed and recommended by the highest ecclesiastical authority in this country and by eminent representatives of the United States government. Besides the plea for the aid which is so badly needed by the victims of the War, the review contains valuable information respecting the country and the people. The neatly printed little pamphlet is well edited by the Rev. J. J. Kaulakis, 324 Wharton Street, Philadelphia.

Among the more recent additions to "The Standard Library" which is being issued by Benziger Brothers (New York) are Anna T. Sadlier's *Women of Catholicity*, *The Life of Mademoiselle le Gras* (Louise de Marillac), Foundress of the Sisters of Charity (the name of the author and translator are not mentioned; but the book is not to be confounded with a volume on the same subject by Lady Lovatt, previously reviewed in these pages.), and *The Life of St. Ignatius of Loyola*. These are all interesting, instructive, and edifying books which should find their way into Catholic homes. The road to this goal is made easy by the relatively low price of the volumes.

Camp St. Mary, the specially equipped camp for seminarians and priests in the Adirondack Mountains, will be kept open this year during the whole of September and the first two weeks of October, viz., until the 15th inclusively. Priests who have not had an opportunity to get away from parish duties during the hot summer months may enjoy the bracing air and see the Adirondacks in their wonderful autumn vesture. Information and particulars as to the route to the camp may be obtained from J. Frank Boone, Manager, Camp St. Mary, Long Lake, New York.

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

CATHOLIC DICTIONARY. Containing Some Account of the Doctrine, Discipline, Rites, Ceremonies, Councils and Religious Orders of the Catholic Church. By William E. Addis, sometime Fellow of the Royal University. Revised with Additions by T. B. Scannell, D. D. Ninth edition. B. Herder, St. Louis. 1917. Pp. 876. Price, \$6.50.

THE MYSTICAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD. An Essay in the Art of Knowing and Loving the Divine Majesty. By Dom Savinien Louismet, O.S.B. P. J. Kenedy & Sons. 1916. Pp. xv—84. Price \$0.80 *postpaid*.

LITTLE PILGRIMS TO OUR LADY OF LOURDES. By Mrs. Francis Blundell (M. E. Francis). P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1916. Pp. viii—183. Price, \$1.20 *postpaid*.

"BLESSED ART THOU AMONG WOMEN." The Life of the Virgin Mother. Illustrated by one hundred and fifty masterpieces of the world's greatest painters. With inspired writings telling the story of the Saviour, prophecies of the felicities attending His coming, His birth and childhood, His victory over Satan in the wilderness. Compiled by William Frederick Butler. Foreword by the Most Rev. John Ireland, D.D., Archbishop of St. Paul. Rand McNally & Co., Chicago. 1916. Pp. xxxiii—315. Price, \$3.50 *postpaid*.

GOD'S ARMOR. A Prayerbook for Soldiers. By P. G. R. Central Bureau of G. R. C. Central Society, St. Louis. 1917. Pp. 56. Price, \$0.12 *net*.

WHICH? THE CHURCH OF MAN OR THE CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST? By the Rev. John J. O'Hara. Veritas Society, Box 131, Bradley Beach, New Jersey. 1917. Pp. 16. Price, \$0.05; \$4.00 per hundred.

CATHOLIC PRAYER BOOK FOR THE ARMY AND NAVY. Arranged and edited by John J. Burke, C.S.P. The Chaplains' Aid Association, 120 West 60th Street, New York. 1917. Pp. 64. Price, \$0.15; \$10.00 per hundred.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL HISTORY OF CHOWAN COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA 1880-1915. By W. Scott Boyce, Ph. D., Assistant Professor of Economics, Connecticut College for Women. (*Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*. Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.) Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 1917. Pp. 293. Price, \$2.50.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN THE LITHOGRAPHIC INDUSTRY. By H. E. Hoagland, Ph. D., Instructor in Economics, University of Illinois. (*Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*. Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.) Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 1917. Pp. 130. Price, \$1.00.

SEPARATION OF STATE AND LOCAL REVENUES IN THE UNITED STATES. By Mabel Newcomer, Ph. D., Instructor in Economics, Vassar College, etc. (*Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*. Edited by the Faculty of Political Science of Columbia University.) Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 1917. Price, \$1.75.

A MODERN JOB. An Essay on the Problem of Evil. By Étienne Giran. With an Introduction by Archdeacon Lilley. Authorized translation by Fred Rothwell. Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago and London. 1916. Pp. 92. Price, \$0.75 *net*.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(LVII).—OCTOBER, 1917.—No. 4.

THE ROSARY.

TO stimulate the devotional life of our people in the United States there is a great variety of beads, made up in varied divisions according to the demands of the particular devotion. Many of these beads are designated by the people as rosaries. It is hoped that this paper may supply accurate information on the Rosary, and also regarding those beads to which the term may be applied. Pope Leo XIII, in his Apostolic Constitution *Ubi primum*,¹ expressly declares that "the true form of the Rosary is to be preserved in reference to the beads by making them up into five, ten, or fifteen decades; likewise, that other beads, of whatever form, are not to be known by the name of rosary".² The ruling of Pope Leo XIII was but the repetition of the previous prohibition of Benedict XIII forbidding "all rosaries newly invented, or which may be invented without the special and previous permission of the Holy See, whereby the aforesaid authentic Rosary, sacred to God and the Blessed Virgin Mary, may, to the prejudice of the faithful, be set aside".³

ESSENTIAL PARTS OF THE ROSARY.

The last canonized Pope, Saint Pius V, defines⁴ accurately the devotion of the Rosary. He says: "It is the psalter of

¹ *Ubi primum*, 2 October, 1898, *Acta Sanctae Sedis*, vol. XXXI, p. 257.

² The *Acta S. Sedis pro Soc. SS. Rosarii* records condemnations of beads which came to be designated by the name of rosary; as the *Seraphic Rosary*, condemned by Pope Alexander VII, *In supremo*, 28 May, 1664; also the *Rosary in honor of the Blessed Trinity*, condemned by Clement XI, *In supremo*, 8 March, 1712.

³ *Pretiosus*, Benedict XIII, 26 May, 1727.

⁴ *Acta S. Sedis pro Soc. SS. Rosarii*, vol. II, par. I, p. 77. *Consueverunt*, S. Pius V, 17 September, 1569.

Mary, in which the Blessed Mother of God is greeted one hundred and fifty times with the Angelical Salutation, corresponding to the psalms of the Psalter of David, together with one Our Father for every ten Hail Marys and also certain meditations that present the entire life of Jesus Christ." The words of the Sovereign Pontiff make it unmistakably clear that there are two essential elements: one, vocal prayer; the other, mental prayer. Without meditation, even though one recites the prescribed Our Fathers and Hail Marys, there is not the devotion of the Rosary; just as meditation on the mysteries without the vocal prayers would not of itself constitute the devotion.

VOCAL PRAYERS OF THE ROSARY.

The vocal prayers are simply the Our Father and the Hail Mary. It is important to note that these are the only vocal prayers that strictly belong to the Rosary. The introductory and concluding prayers, even the "Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost", do not belong essentially to the vocal prayers. Emphasis is not here laid on the vocal prayers that compose the Rosary with a view of introducing any change whatever in the laudable customs that obtain, but only to state, as defined by the Sovereign Pontiff, what are the essential vocal prayers—namely, for the five decades five Our Fathers and fifty Hail Marys—that is, one Our Father is said before each division of ten Hail Marys; for the fifteen decades, simply multiply by three, that is fifteen Our Fathers and one hundred and fifty Hail Marys.

Saints and spiritual writers have found many mystical reasons for the numbers of the vocal prayers. There is the reason already given by Pope Saint Pius V—honoring Mary by repeating one hundred and fifty times the Hail Mary conformably to the number of the psalms of David. The Psalter may mean not only the collection or book of psalms, but also the musical instrument used when these psalms were sung. David said: ⁵ "My Lord, I will sing a new canticle, I will sing a new psalm on the harp of ten cords." The decade of the Rosary may be regarded mystically as a harp of the ten

⁵ Psalm 143.

cords for the song of the Hail Mary that we sing to Our Blessed Mother. Commenting on the Psalter of David, composed of one hundred and fifty psalms, Saint Thomas Aquinas⁶ remarks that by three divisions of fifty we may understand the three states of the Christian people—the state of penance, the state of justice, and the state of glory. So writers and the faithful have made three divisions of fifty of the Psalter of Mary—the Rosary of penance, of justice, and of glory. Saint Charles Borromeo saw another meaning.⁷ Speaking of a part of the Rosary, he said: “The five Our Fathers signify the Five Wounds, the ten Hail Marys bring the Ten Commandments to mind, and the fifty Hail Marys suggest the years of jubilee.” Pope Leo XIII wrote: “The Rosary represents by its arrangement the sweetness of roses and the charm of a garland. This is most fitting as a method of venerating the Virgin Mary, truly called the Mystical Rose of Paradise.”⁸ While it is true that these are only mystical meanings, yet they assume importance in considering the beauty of the devotion. The thoughts of Saints and of the Supreme Pontiffs, the Vicars of Christ, are always important. Nothing need be said of the excellence of the prayer that our Blessed Master Himself taught the Apostles to say; nor of the Hail Mary, which is the message of the Holy Ghost delivered by an angel to her who was to become the Mother of God; nor of the petition of the Church that the same Blessed Mother pray for us sinners during our lives, but especially at the hour of our death.

THE MYSTERIES OF THE ROSARY.

The mysteries of the Rosary are divided into the Joyful, Sorrowful, and Glorious events—mysteries, indeed, but historical facts as well of the lives of our Lord and His Blessed Mother and the work of our redemption. The mysteries of the Rosary are unchangeable, in the sense that the Sacred Congregation of Indulgences⁹ has declared that one cannot gain the indulgences of the Rosary if other mysteries or pious

⁶ *Proemium in Psalmos.*

⁷ Fanfani, *Il Rosario*, p. 16.

⁸ *Fidentem piumque animum*, 20 September, 1896.

⁹ 13 August, 1726. *Acta S. Sedis pro Soc. SS. Ros.*, vol. II, par. III, p. 802; *Ubi primum*, N. XIII.

meditations be substituted for the regular ones. In the private recitation of the Rosary, the set of mysteries which one may prefer can be selected for meditation. Custom, which was later approved by Apostolic authority, has assigned sets of mysteries for the different days of the week in the public recitation of the Rosary.¹⁰ Beginning with Monday, the mysteries are assigned according to the historical or chronological order. Thus, on Monday the Joyful Mysteries are the subject of meditation, on Tuesday the Sorrowful, and on Wednesday the Glorious Mysteries. Then, one takes again on Thursday the Joyful, on Friday the Sorrowful, and on Saturday the Glorious Mysteries. The Glorious Mysteries are assigned to Sunday meditations throughout the entire year.

In the private recitation it is not necessary to form with the lips the sentence that expresses the mystery for meditation. It is sufficient to recall it to one's mind.¹¹ When, however, the Rosary is recited in public, the necessity is manifest of bringing the mystery to the minds of those reciting it by a clear public announcement. The mysteries again emphasize the fact that the Rosary is a mental as well as a vocal prayer. If meditation be omitted, an essential element is lacking. Without meditation we may have prayer, indeed, but not the prayer of the Rosary. Meditation is preferably made on the mystery while one recites the Our Father and ten Hail Marys.¹² The meditation may, however, precede or follow the recitation of the Our Father and ten Hail Marys on the following conditions: First, there must be a distinct meditation for each decade on the mystery assigned to it; secondly, there must be a moral union between the vocal prayers of the decade and the meditation on its mystery.¹³ It is understood of course that such meditations need be but very brief.

PREACHING AND ROSARY MEDITATIONS.

The relation of the Rosary to preaching is intimate and most important. There can be no adequate accounting of the

¹⁰ S. C. Indul. 1 July, 1839, *Acta S. Sedis pro Soc. SS. Ros.*, vol. II, par. III, p. 868; *Ubi primum*, N. XIII.

¹¹ S. C. Indul. 1 July, 1839.

¹² *Ibidem*.

¹³ *Acta S. Sedis pro Soc. SS. Ros.*, vol. I, p. 56, N. 135.

credits of truly apostolic preaching for the propagation of the Rosary throughout the entire Christian world. In God's providence, therefore, we find the special custodians and propagators of the Rosary to be the Friars of the Order of Preachers. In our day and for our conditions in the United States one might venture to hope for even more gratifying results in the spiritual life of our people if greater value were placed on meditation, and if our preachers were to insist more on its necessity and advantages and to instruct in a practical way their flocks how to meditate. As a distinct exercise, meditation among the laity, even those aspiring to and striving for the higher things of the spiritual life, is unfortunately rare. How many of the faithful, speaking of the Rosary, are heard to say: "I cannot meditate." Their assertion is not true. Timid souls who think that meditation is such a profound exercise of the spiritual life that they dare not venture upon it, should have their fears dispelled by the simple instruction of preachers. To say that one cannot meditate is equivalent to the assertion that one cannot think, cannot love. Meditation is simply knowing and thinking and loving. Pope Benedict XIII granted a dispensation from meditation only in favor of the very ignorant and uncultured whose minds remain undeveloped and untrained. The same Pontiff urged that even these be taught to accustom themselves to meditate on the mysteries of their redemption formulated in the prayer of the Rosary.¹⁴ The Rosary offers the simplest possible means of teaching the faithful in a practical way the duty and advantage of meditation. They should be encouraged occasionally, or even frequently, to meditate according to their ability. If they cannot name or bring to mind the mysteries of the Rosary, they should be impressed with the necessity of learning them and of grouping some thoughts about each mystery. The Christian who thinks frequently of his salvation, and of the mysteries of our Lord's life which purchased it, as presented in the Rosary, will be likely to keep up his striving for a better and holier life. Some plans and methods of meditation, intended as helps or instructions, produce rather the effect of discouragement. The priest and preacher who is faithful to

¹⁴ *Pretiosus*, 26 May, 1727, *Acta S. Sedis SS. Ros.*, vol. II, par. I, p. 384.

his own daily meditation, and who is a true client of the Rosary, will have little difficulty in instructing his people regarding the simplicity of meditation and the necessity and advantage of its exercise.

Does not October, especially, offer a time when a course of instructions or sermons could be arranged on the necessity and value of meditation for our people, however active or unintellectual their lives may be? The simple principles of meditation could be applied to the Rosary. Would it not be both advantageous and practical to take mystery after mystery, and to teach the faithful how to make the Rosary meditation? Nothing takes the place of the living voice of the teacher who has authority to preach the Word of God. Proof of this is the number of Bibles and books to aid Bible study put forth by Protestantism as a substitute for the living, authoritative word of the teacher. Similarly, it is a mistake to conclude that the preacher is released from the obligation to teach the people how to meditate—especially to meditate on the mysteries of the Rosary—because of the great number of books and pamphlets issued on the subject. The people have and always will have need of the practical instruction of the preacher as to how meditation should be made. Where there is daily recitation of the beautiful prayer of the Rosary, and meditation on its mysteries, there is, as Leo XIII¹⁵ declared, “in the soul an unction of the sweetest fragrance, with the effect, indeed, of having heard with loving attention the voice of the Blessed Mother of Heaven instructing us in the divine mysteries and directing us in the way of salvation.” The same Pontiff said:¹⁶ “It is not affirming too much to hold that ignorance and error will not banish faith from the place or home or nation where the practice of the Rosary is maintained with the honor of former days.”

RECITATION OF THE ROSARY.

The excellence of the vocal prayers and the value of meditation on the mysteries make clear the advantage of the recitation of the Rosary. A prayer so excellent and so profitable

¹⁵ Leo XIII, *Magnæ Dei Matris*, Encycl. Letter, 8 September, 1892, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XXV, p. 139.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*.

should naturally be said in as fitting a manner as possible. The Rosary should be the common family prayer for the home, as well as the public prayer for the church. It is par excellence the prayer for one's private devotion.

IN THE HOME.

There is no history that can adequately recount or describe the devotion of the Irish people to the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. In the days of the worst persecution of Ireland, when Mass was infrequent or impossible, the Rosary became a substitute in the Irish home for the august Sacrifice. How much the prayer of the Rosary contributed to preserve Ireland's faith only eternity will reveal. The mysteries told of the Incarnation, of the passion and death of the Lord for the salvation of men. Meditation on the glories of the risen Master and on the life of His Blessed Mother gave the Irish the courage to suffer persecution and inspired in them the hope of receiving an eternal reward for all the sufferings endured for Christ and His faith.

We must thank God for the many and extraordinary blessings bestowed on the Church in the United States. The enemy of religion, however, is neither put out of action nor at rest. There are many lurking dangers. Recently the Holy See¹⁷ deemed it well to call attention to the special dangers menacing our country and the faithful in the United States. There is, first, the attack on the sacred institution of the home "by the means so easily at hand of securing civil divorce, thereby uprooting the foundation of the family." Lack of respect for lawfully constituted authority, civil, ecclesiastic, and domestic, and a refusal to acknowledge that all authority is from God are among the gravest dangers to society in our times. The Holy See scents the presence of error and danger where the welfare of souls is in question. The Vicar of Christ has sounded a note of warning for us. We are bidden to beware of that "excessive independence which holds no authority, not even paternal, as sacred."¹⁸

This insidious attack on authority is the germ of revolution against the home, the State, and the Church. Would not

¹⁷ *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, 1 March, 1917, Num. 3, p. 102.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*.

priests and parents do well to take not one but many measures of repression and prevention against the enemy? It cannot be doubted that the revival of the family recitation of the beads immediately after the evening meal, or at any other time of the evening to suit the convenience of the majority of the family, will bring many a blessing on the home and will increase respect for the authority of this sacred domestic institution. The union of many forces will contribute to the revival of this beautiful custom. The particular counsel or exhortation given by our bishops in their respective dioceses may be quoted with great effect by missionaries in their sermons urging the family recitation of the Rosary. Frequent and instructive appeals of the parochial clergy must be counted on to give permanency to the introductory work of the missionaries. The insistence by the Sisters of our parish schools that the children under their care become little apostles of the Rosary, both for the introduction and maintainence of the family Rosary recital in their homes; the coöperation of truly religious fathers and mothers—found to some extent in every parish—who constitute themselves promoters among their acquaintances and friends; the systematic workers, namely, the prefects of the great Rosary Sodality of the Blessed Virgin—all these are forces which, coöperating for the same end, can make the family recitation nation-wide, thereby calling down many blessings from God upon the homes of our country. Their work will surely do much to reëstablish the idea that the home is not merely a place for sleeping and eating and drinking, but a sacred institution established by God. We are busy in the United States with many movements, and we have the well-founded hope through them to better conditions. It should be made clear to all that whatever elevates and sanctifies the home confers immeasurable benefits upon society. It is the solid and permanent foundation for social betterment. Let there be the family recitation of the Rosary in every Catholic home throughout the nation, and the prayer will become an agency most potent in our Catholic social service. Leo XIII hoped that every Catholic family would let no day pass without the family recitation of the Rosary.¹⁹ The Church, to

¹⁹ Leo XIII, *Epistola in forma Brevis: Salutaris ille spiritus præcum*, 24 December, 1883, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XVI, p. 209.

express her approval and to encourage the faithful in this holy practice, has been very generous in her grant of indulgences for the family recitation of the Rosary.²⁰

PUBLIC RECITAL IN CHURCHES.

It is customary in all Dominican churches of the United States to have the public recitation of the Rosary every evening of the year. In many other parishes the same laudable custom obtains. Pope Leo XIII urged that in every cathedral church throughout the world the Rosary be recited daily.²¹ The same Pontiff wished that in all churches where the Rosary Confraternity is established, there be, as far as possible, the daily public recitation of the Rosary.²² In all parish churches, even though the Rosary Confraternity be not established, the Pope of the Rosary asks for the public recitation of the Rosary on Sundays and holidays of obligation.²³ For these prayers the Church in her cordial and generous approval grants extraordinary indulgences.²⁴ During the month of October, and until the second of November inclusive, in all parish churches of the world and in all churches dedicated to the Blessed Mother of God, as well as in all other churches of which the bishop of the diocese approves, the Pope of the Rosary wished at least a third part of the Rosary to be said before the Blessed Sacrament exposed for the adoration of the faithful.²⁵

THE ROSARY FOR ONE'S PRIVATE DEVOTION.

The private recitation of the Rosary contributes immeasurably to the individual's sanctification. The theory of this is

²⁰ Leo XIII, List of Indulgences, 29 August, 1899; S. C. Indul. Cfr. *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XXXII, p. 228. An indulgence of ten years granted to the faithful in general for the family recitation of the five decades or for those who in church recite the Rosary with others.

²¹ Leo XIII, *Salutaris ille*, as in note no. 19

²² Leo XIII, Const. *Ubi primum*, 2 Oct., 1898, N. XIII.

²³ Leo XIII, *Salutaris ille*, as in note no. 19.

²⁴ List of Indul. Leo XIII. Fifty years indulgence once a day can be gained by those who are members of the Rosary Confraternity provided they recite the five mysteries of the Rosary in any part of the church from which the Rosary Altar can be seen. In addition there are the indulgences as in note no. 20.

²⁵ Leo XIII, Encycl. *Supremi Apostolatus*, 1 Sept. 1883, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XVI, p. 113. Leo XIII, Encycl. *Superiore anni*, 30 Aug. 1884, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XVII, p. 49, S. C. Rit. 20 Aug. 1885, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XVIII, p. 95.

If the October Devotions be held in the morning after Mass, then, of course the Blessed Sacrament should not be exposed. S. C. Rit. 20 Aug. 1885.

clear. It is, indeed, a fact confirmed by experience that the unfailling habit of reciting the Rosary and of meditating on its mysteries develops taste for this form of prayer and enables one to enjoy its practice. One who says the five mysteries but seldom, experiences the tediousness and the monotony of the prayer because its varied beauties, especially those of the meditation, are not manifested. Question the priests or the faithful who say the fifteen mysteries once, or even twice, a day and you will find that the prayer for them is a joy and a consolation. Many priests have the habit of saying five mysteries as part of their thanksgiving after Holy Mass, while many of the faithful observe the same practice in their thanksgiving after Holy Communion. With a little determination it becomes a very easy matter to find time during the day at five, or ten, or even at fifteen, different odd moments to say a decade of the Rosary. The habit once formed, is very easy to keep up. Who can question the great advantage of turning to God through His Blessed Mother several times each day? This self-imposed obligation is sure to have its great effect on the life of the individual. By such practical methods one grows to love the prayer of the Rosary and to profit especially by its meditations. It is now permitted to all the faithful to say one decade at a time, provided the five decades be said within the natural day of twenty-four hours.²⁶

Our duty to the dead, especially those who have a claim on us, should furnish us with an impelling motive for the frequent recitation of the Rosary. After the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the Rosary is one of the greatest means in our power to assist the souls in purgatory.

²⁶ The S. C. Indulgences, 22 January, 1858, replied that the decades of the Rosary could not be separated in the recitation except by Rosarians, and then only when they were discharging their weekly obligation of saying the fifteen mysteries. At the same time the S. Congregation replied that it was not expedient to petition the Holy See for a further extension of this privilege. (*Acta S. Sedis SS. Ros.*, vol. II, p. III, p. 903). On the request of the Master General of the Dominicans Pope Pius X granted the privilege to Rosarians only of saying but a decade of beads at a time in every recitation of the Rosary, provided the five decades were said during the day. (*Analecta O. P.* 14 Oct. 1906, p. 748). On 8 July 1908 Pope Pius X extended to all the faithful the privilege of saying but one decade at a time (S. C. Indulg., *Analecta O. P.*, vol. VIII, p. 634).

MANNER OF RECITING THE ROSARY.

It must be emphasized again that the only essential vocal prayers of the Rosary are the Our Father and the Hail Mary. It may be that the various prayers added in accordance with the customs of many countries often deter individuals from saying more frequently in private the five decades of the Rosary.

ESSENTIAL REQUIREMENTS.

In the private recitation of the Rosary one may do all that is required by the Church by observing the following:

1. begin simply by saying the Our Father;
2. say immediately ten Hail Marys;
3. the meditation on the mystery may precede or follow the Our Father and ten Hail Marys, but preferably it accompanies the recitation;
4. at least one decade at a time must be said and the five decades recited within the natural day of twenty-four hours.²⁷

What applies to one decade is applicable to the recitation of the five, ten, and fifteen decades. Thus, no introductory or terminating prayers for one or five decades; no "Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost"; no forming with the lips the words that announce the mystery, it being sufficient to recall this to one's mind, are essentially necessary. It is a matter of certainty that Pope Pius IX when he recited the Rosary²⁸ with those about him in the evening for the souls of the faithful departed, used to say, "May the souls of the faithful departed through the mercy of God rest in peace", instead of the "Glory be to the Father". If one's private devotion suggests this, or if it be said in public, the "Glory be to the Father" would then naturally be omitted.

GENERAL CUSTOM OF THE UNITED STATES.

It is customary in most churches of the United States to say the Rosary as follows:

1. the Apostles' Creed.
2. the Our Father.

²⁷ Cfr. note 26.

²⁸ *Il Rosario*, Fanfani, O. P., p. 4.

3. three Hail Marys.
4. the Our Father (which is properly the beginning of the Rosary).

It is sometimes erroneously stated that these introductory prayers have come into rather general use because they are permitted by way of privilege for those who cannot or who do not wish to meditate on the mysteries. Where this false notion prevails it should be corrected. As in most countries, there are varying customs as to the concluding prayers. It is clearly against the express wish of the Church that the beautiful simplicity of the Rosary be destroyed, especially by the private devotions of well-meaning but unwise pious souls who wish to bring about in the public recitation of the Rosary the addition of certain prayers, or the intermingling of ejaculations or words that appeal to their sense of piety.²⁹

IN DOMINICAN CHURCHES.

In all Dominican churches of the United States, as well as in many churches that have adopted the practice of the Order of Preachers, the Rosary is recited as follows, without the introductory prayers of the Creed, Our Father, and three Hail Marys:

Priest, Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee!

Congregation, Blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus.

Priest, O Lord, open Thou my lips.

Congregation, And my tongue shall announce Thy praise.

Priest, Incline unto my aid, O God!

Congregation, O Lord, make haste to help me.

Priest, Glory be to the Father, etc.

Congregation, As it was in the beginning, etc.

The announcement of the mystery is then simply made and the first Our Father and ten Hail Marys, or first decade, immediately follow. The five decades are concluded by the following prayers:

1. Hail Holy Queen.

2. the versicle and response, " Queen of the Holy Rosary,"
" Pray for us ";

²⁹ S. C. Indulg. 1 Sept. 1884, *Acta S. Sedis SS. Ros.* Cfr. notam vol. II, p. III, p. 769.

3. the Rosary prayer, as found in the Breviary for the Feast of the Rosary.

Although varying customs obtain in Dominican communities and churches throughout the world, due to local piety, it is important to remember that these additional prayers need not be said as a condition for gaining the indulgences of the Rosary and may be omitted, especially in private recitation.

THE GREAT ROSARY SODALITY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

The older and pioneer Dominican Fathers of the United States usually referred to the Rosary Confraternity as "the Great Sodality of the Blessed Virgin." The designation emphasized the fact that the Confraternity of the Rosary is truly a Sodality preëminent among all sodalities of the Blessed Virgin, and expresses too its relation to the Sodalities of the "Living Rosary" and "Perpetual Rosary." In studying the documents of the great Pope of the Rosary, Leo XIII,³⁰ on his favorite devotion, one is transported to the sublime heights of the Pontiff's thoughts and is lost in admiration. Speaking of societies of the Church in general, Pope Leo XIII³¹ passes on to the great Rosary Sodality or Confraternity in particular. "We do not hesitate," says the Pontiff, "to assign a preëminent place among these societies to that known as the Society of the Holy Rosary. If we regard its origin, we find it distinguished by its antiquity, for Saint Dominic himself

³⁰ There are eleven Encyclicals on the Rosary from the years 1883 to 1898 as follows: *Supremi Apostolatus*, 1 Sept. 1883; *Superiore anno*, 30 Aug. 1884, *Quamquam pluries*, 15 Aug. 1889; *Octobri mense*, 22 Sept. 1891; *Magnae Dei Matris*, 8 Sept. 1892; *Laetitia sanctae*, 8 Sept. 1893; *Jucunda semper*, 8 Sept. 1894; *Adjutricem populi Christiani*, 5 Sept. 1895; *Fidentem piumque animum*, 20 Sept. 1896; *Augustissimae Virginis Mariae*, 12 Sept. 1897; *Diuturni temporis spatium*, 5 Sept. 1898. There is one letter of the Holy Father to the Bishops of Italy, *Vi è ben noto*, 20 Sept. 1887. The Encyclical *Quod auctoritate apostolica*, 22 Dec. 1885, proclaiming the extraordinary Jubilee for the year 1886, decreed that it should be under the Protection of the Queen of the Rosary. There are three Apostolic Briefs, *Salutaris ille*, 24 Dec. 1883; *Tua providentia*, 13 Mar. 1894; *Jam nemini dubium* 4 May 1901. There are four decrees, *Urbis et Orbis*, S. C. Rit.—10 Dec. 1883; 20 Aug. 1885; 11 Sept. 1887; 5 Aug. 1885. There is a "Decretum generale" S. C. Rit., 19 Jun. 1884. There is one Apostolic Constitution, *Ubi primum*, 2 Oct. 1898. There is a Letter Apostolic on the Church of Our Lady of the Rosary at Lourdes, *Parta humano generi*, 8 Sept. 1901. There is a letter to Fr. Becchi, O. P., on the Perpetual Rosary in Italy, 28 Mar. 1901. In all there are twenty-four Papal documents of Pope Leo XIII on the Rosary.

³¹ Encyl. *Augustissimae Virginis Mariae*, 12 Sept. 1897, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XXX, p. 129.

is said to have been its founder. If we estimate its privileges, we see it enriched with a vast number of them granted by the munificence of our predecessors. The form of the association, its very soul, is the Rosary of Our Lady, of the excellence of which we have elsewhere spoken at length. Still, the virtue and efficacy of the Rosary appear all the greater when considered as the special office of the Sodality that bears its name. Every one knows how necessary prayer is for all men; not that God's decrees can be changed, but, as St. Gregory says, 'that men by asking may merit to receive what Almighty God hath decreed from eternity to grant to them'. And St. Augustine says: 'He who knoweth how to pray aright, knoweth how to live aright.' But prayers acquire their greatest efficacy in obtaining God's assistance when offered publicly, by large numbers, constantly and unanimously, so as to form, as it were, a single chorus of supplication; as those words of the Acts of the Apostles clearly declare, wherein the disciples of Christ, awaiting the coming of the Holy Ghost, are said to have been 'persevering with one mind in prayer'. Those who practise this manner of prayer will never fail to obtain certain fruit. Such is certainly the case with the members of the Rosary Sodality. Just as by the recitation of the Divine Office, priests offer a public, constant and most efficacious supplication, so the supplication offered by the members of this Sodality in the recitation of the Rosary, or 'Psalter of Our Lady,' as it has been styled by some of the Popes, is also in a way public, constant, and universal." "Since, as we have said, public prayers are much more excellent and more efficacious than private ones, so ecclesiastical writers have given to the Rosary Sodality the title of 'the army of prayer, enrolled by St. Dominic under the banner of the Mother of God.'" ⁸²

It would be interesting and most profitable to group or collect all the appreciations of the Sovereign Pontiffs on the Rosary. Saint Pius V and Leo XIII stand out prominent among the Popes who loved the devotion of the Rosary. The Apostolic Constitution of the latter, *Ubi primum*, 2 October, 1898, is one of the most important documents ever issued by the Popes on the Rosary. It deserves to be much better known

⁸² Translation from *The Rosary Guide*, Proctor, O. P. Ed. London 1901.

than it is. From this document, as from the list of indulgences which it promised, and which was published the following year,³³ it is manifest that one does not take advantage of all the privileges of the Rosary devotion and of its extraordinary indulgences unless one enjoys membership in the Great Rosary Sodality of the Blessed Virgin. The ancient Sodality of Our Blessed Lady must not be confused with or thought to be the same as either the "Living Rosary" or "The Perpetual Rosary".³⁴

Thousands of the great Rosary sodalities of the Blessed Virgin have been established in the United States, in large measure through the efforts of the late Father Charles Hyacinth McKenna, O.P.³⁵ The requirements for the establishment of

³³ S. C. Indulg. 29 Aug. *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XXXII, p. 228.

³⁴ The "Living Rosary" was founded in France in the year 1826 by a pious woman whose name was Mary Pauline Jaricot. Her idea was to group individuals together, each person representing a living decade of the Rosary for the space of one month only. The obligation of each living decade was to say each day of the month the same decade of the Rosary; thus, the fifteen persons so grouped would say each day the entire Rosary. Membership had to be renewed each month and the mystery assigned for the same period. For this purpose leaflets determining the mysteries were distributed among the associates each month. The idea was to induce persons to recite the Rosary, and to develop gradually in them a taste for the devotion and so prepare them for membership in the Great Sodality of the Blessed Virgin of the Rosary. The "Living Rosary" was transferred by Pope Pius IX on 17 August, 1877 to the jurisdiction of the Master General of the Dominicans. (Cfr. *Acta S. Sedis. Soc. SS. Ros.*, vol. II, par. II, p. 499.)

"The Perpetual Rosary" is entirely distinct from the "Living Rosary." It is, however, dependent on the Great Rosary Sodality of the Blessed Virgin in the sense that it presupposes it. In other words, one must belong to the Great Rosary Sodality before seeking membership in the Association of the "Perpetual Rosary." It simply means that members of the Rosary Sodality who wish to assume additional obligations are banded together and so organized that there is a perpetual recitation of the Rosary. The organization admits of one assuming the obligation of an hour each day or each night, or one hour a week, or one hour a month, or even one hour in the year, as one's devotion suggests and one's duties permit, during which hour the Rosary will be recited continuously. The Founder of the "Perpetual Rosary" was Fr. Timothy Ricci, O. P. It is frequently attributed to Fr. Petronius Martini of Bologna, who was a great propagator of the devotion. In 1650 and in 1654 the General Chapters of the Dominican Order petitioned the Holy See to approve of the Association of the Perpetual Rosary. Popes Alexander XVII, Clement X, Innocent IX, Pius VII and Pius IX blessed and granted indulgences to the Association. The venerable Fr. Saintourens, O. P., of Camden, N. J., founder of the Sisters of Perpetual Rosary in the United States, has succeeded in founding seven Monasteries of these Sisters in our country. He has long wished for and prayed for the development of the Association of the Perpetual Rosary in the United States. His work is calling and awaiting one who has genius for organization. What immeasurable blessings the prayers of such an association would call down upon our people and clergy and country!

³⁵ His death occurred 21 February, 1917.

this Sodality, as well as for membership in it, are most simple. Full information can be had on request from the offices of the Apostolate of the Rosary.³⁶ It is most important to note that there is no arrangement in this great ancient Sodality of Our Blessed Mother making one Sodality depend on another, not even upon the ancient Rosary societies of Rome. There is no such thing as an archconfraternity of the Rosary, although the term is sometimes used.³⁷ All are equal, all have the same privileges, without any exception, in the whole world. Once a sodality is established, it is entirely independent of every other sodality. Its rights and privileges and autonomy have a corporate existence in the Church by a charter emanating from the Holy See, which is issued through the agency of the Master General of the Order of Preachers. There is a mistaken notion in some places that there is a kind of dependence on the sodalities established in Dominican churches, especially in those cities where the Order of Preachers has priories and churches. No such dependence exists. Special arrangements must be made in such cases, and the bishop of the diocese where the sodality is to be established must dispense from the prohibition of Clement VIII.³⁸ There is no necessity whatsoever of sending names of members of the Sodality from parishes where the society is established to Dominican churches for registration. Names of members may be inscribed in any church where the great Rosary Sodality of Our Blessed Mother is established. In the United States, all pastors desiring the ancient Sodality of the Rosary can secure the Roman diploma from the offices of the Apostolate of the Rosary in New York and California.³⁹ It is most important to note that many of the extraordinary indulgences for the recitation of the Rosary cannot be gained unless one is a member of the ancient Rosary Sodality.

³⁶ Apostolate of the Rosary,
869 Lexington Avenue,
New York City.

Apostolate of the Rosary,
2390 Bush Street,
San Francisco, Cal.

³⁷ *Acta S. Sedis SS. Ros.* vol. I, p. 10, N. 14.

³⁸ *Ubi primum*, N. V., S. C. Indulg., 20 May 1896, *Analecta O. P.*, vol. II, anno IV, p. 591, Cfr. also *Analecta O. P.* vol. I, anno I, p. 160, nota 2.

³⁹ See addresses in note 36. In the faculties of some dioceses of the United States the statement is still found that our bishops are authorized to establish the Rosary Confraternity. This faculty was revoked by Leo XIII in the *Ubi primum*, N. 11.

OBLIGATIONS.

The obligations of the ancient Rosary Sodality are very simple. They are as follows: 1. to have one's rosary blessed by a priest who is authorized to impart the Dominican blessing;⁴⁰ 2. to have one's name inscribed in the register of the Rosary Sodality, which means in the register of any church in the world where the Sodality is canonically established (in the United States our splendid parish system ought to be encouraged and strengthened rather than weakened in any way. The faithful ought therefore to be urged to become members of the Rosary Sodality in their own parish churches; provided the Society is there canonically established); 3. to say during the week the fifteen mysteries of the Rosary. At least one decade at a time should be said in discharging this obligation.

Any further duties that the members of the great Rosary Sodality assume, either as a society or as individuals, depend upon the special arrangements of the parish or diocese. Members may be organized to further the interests of any good work of the parish on the approval of the bishop.⁴¹ In many parishes the Sodality is organized to assume in a financial way the responsibilities of the Altar Society. Members may undertake any work that their pastor thinks well to give them for the good of religion in the parish. Any special statutes regulating their work should have the approval of the bishop of the diocese.⁴² It is very desirable to find work for Rosarians to do. The spirit of parish loyalty should be inculcated in them.

INDULGENCES.

On the 29 August, 1899, Pope Leo XIII⁴³ approved a list of indulgences, all previous lists thereby becoming obsolete. The two divisions of the list emphasize in the most striking way the great advantages of membership in the ancient Sodality of the Rosary, the first part enumerating the extraordinary grants of a long line of Popes to Rosarians only, the second part the

⁴⁰ Priests desiring personal faculties to attach the Dominican blessing to rosaries can obtain them from the offices of the Apostolate of the Rosary. Addresses in note 36.

⁴¹ *Ubi primum*, N. VII.

⁴² *Ibidem*.

⁴³ S. C. Indulg., *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XXXII, p. 228.

indulgences which the faithful in general, as well as members of the Sodality, can gain.

To the list of Leo XIII are to be added the important and generous concessions of Pope Pius X. In studying the grants of indulgences to members of the great Rosary Sodality of the Blessed Virgin and to the faithful in general, one is at a loss whether to marvel more at the generosity of the Church in drawing upon the exhaustless treasury that she possesses or at the unqualified approval given to the devotion of the Rosary as expressed by the lavish grants of indulgences. The complete list of indulgences should be found in every Catholic home, and parents might profitably be urged to inculcate in their children a great appreciation of the Rosary and its spiritual advantages. Attention is directed to only a few of the indulgences granted. The list of indulgences is a very long one.

INDULGENCES FOR ALL THE FAITHFUL, INCLUDING ROSARIANS.⁴⁴

Provided rosaries are blessed by priests having faculties to give the Dominican blessings, one can gain: 1. an indulgence of 100 days for each Our Father and Hail Mary of the five decades; 2. an indulgence of 5 years and 5 Lents for the same five decades; 3. an indulgence of 10 years and 10 Lents once a day for saying five decades with others at home or in church, or in a public or private chapel (This indulgence should encourage the family recitation of the Rosary. Priests and parents will bring untold blessings on the Catholic homes of our country, if they make this custom nation-wide. In the family recitation of the Rosary it may be suggested that the following intentions be prayed for in the recital of the Rosary: (a) for our Holy Father, (b) for the intentions of the bishop of the diocese; (c) that God may bless the parish; (d) that God may bless the home and family; (e) for the deceased members of the family); 4. in one and the same recitation the Dominican and Crozier indulgences can be gained, provided the beads have both blessings;⁴⁵ 5. a plenary indulgence for each visit made on the Feast of the Rosary (first Sunday of October) to the Rosary altar, not only in Dominican churches, but as well in the thousands of churches throughout the United

⁴⁴ List of Indulgences, Leo XIII, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XXXII, p. 228.

⁴⁵ S. C. Indulg. 12 June 1907, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. LX, p. 442.

States where the great Rosary Sodality of Our Blessed Mother is established.⁴⁶ This indulgence can be gained from noon on Saturday to midnight on Rosary Sunday.⁴⁷

To satisfy the prescribed conditions of confession, Communion, visit to the church, and prayers for the intentions of our Holy Father, the following should be noted: 1. one may go to confession eight days before the Feast of the Holy Rosary;⁴⁸ 2. for daily communicants and for those who receive Holy Communion five times during each week, confession is not strictly required;⁴⁹ 3. each visit must be distinct, that is, one must leave the church and reënter it when more than one visit is to be made;⁵⁰ 4. no prescribed prayers are to be said at each visit; one is free to say those prayers that his or her devotion suggests for the intentions of our Holy Father.⁵¹ Five Our Fathers and five Hail Marys will suffice, or a decade of the Rosary. If the decade of the Rosary be chosen as the prayer to be said at these visits, one should say the five decades within the day if the indulgences for the recital of the Rosary are to be gained, even though five visits be not made.⁵²

INDULGENCES FOR ROSARIANS ONLY.

1. A plenary indulgence can be gained once a day by members of the great Rosary Sodality of the Blessed Virgin who say the fifteen decades within the natural day of twenty-four hours, provided they approach the sacraments, visit a public church or chapel, and say the fifteen mysteries for the intention of the triumph of the Church.⁵³ Can we not urge most of our daily communicants in the United States to take advantage at once of this grant, which is not as well known as it should be? It will surely be one of the best means within their power of giving proof of their love and loyalty to the Holy See.

⁴⁶ *Acta S. Sedis Soc. SS. Ros.*, vol. I, p. 81, N. 208.

⁴⁷ S. C. S. O., Sec. Indulg., 26 Jan. 1911, *Acta Apost. Sedis*, vol. III, p. 64.

⁴⁸ Cong. S. O., Sec. Indulg., 23 April, 1914, *Acta Apost. Sedis*, vol. VI, p. 308.

⁴⁹ S. C. Indulg., 14 Feb. 1906, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XXXIX, p. 62.

⁵⁰ *Acta S. Sedis Soc. SS. Ros.* vol. II, par. III, nota 3, pp. 917, 918.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, p. 869.

⁵² S. C. Indulg., 8 July 1908, *Analecta O. P.* vol. VIII, p. 634.

⁵³ S. C. Indulg., 12 June 1907, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XL, p. 511.

2. For Rosarians who recite the entire Rosary the plenary and partial indulgences granted to Spain, can be gained.⁵⁴

3. Rosarians who reverently carry the rosary on their person for the love of the Blessed Virgin, even without reciting any prayers, can gain an indulgence of 100 years and 100 Lents each day.⁵⁵

4. Fifty years can be gained once a day by Rosarians who say five mysteries of the Rosary at the altar or chapel of the Rosary in any church where the ancient Rosary Sodality of the Blessed Virgin is established. Members who live far from such a church can gain this indulgence in any church or public chapel.⁵⁶

5. An indulgence of 2025 days for each time the Holy Name of Jesus is pronounced in every Hail Mary during the recitation of the Rosary. Thus, for five decades this grant should be multiplied by fifty, and for the entire Rosary by one hundred and fifty.⁵⁷

6. Together with the extraordinary indulgences for pronouncing the Holy Name of Jesus in the Hail Mary during the recitation of the Rosary, one can gain at the same recitation all the Crozier indulgences, provided the beads have received both blessings.⁵⁸ Five hundred days' indulgence for each Hail Mary and Our Father can be gained as the Crozier indulgence.

7. To encourage meditation among Rosarians, an indulgence of seven years and seven Lents is granted for every half-hour's meditation and 100 days for each quarter of an hour.⁵⁹

8. On the first Sunday of each month Rosarians can gain four plenary indulgences: (a) one as indicated under number 1; (b) a second plenary indulgence for being present at the Rosary procession, saying some prayers for the intentions of the Pope and making a visit to the Rosary altar or chapel;⁶⁰

⁵⁴ List of Indulg. Leo XIII, Par. I, N. 4. This indulgence was first extended to Rosarians by Clement IX, 22 Feb. 1668. Whatever precisely the indulgences are they can be gained by Rosarians.

⁵⁵ S. C. Indulg., 31 July 1906, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XL, p. 442.

⁵⁶ List of Indulg., Leo XIII, par. I, N. 4.

⁵⁷ List of Indulg., Leo XIII, Par. I, N. 8.

⁵⁸ S. C. Indulg., 12 June 1907, *Acta S. Sedis*, vol. XL, p. 442.

⁵⁹ List of Indulg., Leo XIII, Par. I, N. 10.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, N. 3.

(c) a third plenary indulgence for Rosarians who go to confession and Communion on the first Sunday of the month, visit the church or chapel of the Rosary, and pray for the intentions of the Pope;⁶¹ (d) a fourth plenary indulgence can be gained by Rosarians who visit our Lord exposed in the Blessed Sacrament in any church where the Sodality is established, and pray for the intentions of the Pope.⁶² It is understood, of course, that for these four plenary indulgences, confession and Communion are necessary, as already explained, according to the decisions of the Sacred Congregations.

The above indulgences convey some idea, at least, of the generosity of the Church with her indulgences to Rosarians, but it is necessary to study the official list of Pope Leo XIII to have a fair estimate of it. It may be said that the Church's generosity in this regard seems almost incredible.⁶³

FR. JOHN T. McNICHOLAS, O.P.

Collegio Angelico, Rome.

THE NEW CODE OF CANON LAW.

THE new codification of Canon Law is completed. The steps that led up to this memorable event in the history of ecclesiastical jurisprudence are best set forth by the reigning Pontiff in his Bull *Providentissima Mater Ecclesia*, in which he promulgates the new Code. We submit the following translation of the Latin original.

TO OUR VENERABLE BRETHREN AND BELOVED SONS, THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATES, ARCHBISHOPS, BISHOPS, AND OTHER ORDINARIES, AND ALSO TO PROFESSORS AND STUDENTS OF CATHOLIC UNIVERSITIES AND SEMINARIES.

BENEDICT BISHOP

Servant of the Servants of God

For a perpetual remembrance.

The Church, most provident mother, endowed by her Divine Founder with all the requisites of a perfect society, when, in obe-

⁶¹ Ibidem, N. 4.

⁶² Ibidem.

⁶³ Complete information about the indulgences, etc., can be had from the offices of the Apostolate of the Rosary, 869 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

dience to the Lord's mandate, she commenced in the very beginning of her existence to teach and govern all nations, undertook by promulgating laws the task of guiding and safeguarding the discipline of the clergy and the faithful.

As time elapsed, particularly after she had gained her liberty and, daily waxing stronger, had extended her kingdom, she never ceased to set forth and to define her own inherent right of making laws. Witness in proof of this the many and various decrees of the Roman Pontiffs and Ecumenical Councils which were published as the times and circumstances suggested. By these laws and enactments not only did she make wise provision for the direction of the clergy and people, but, as history bears witness, she promoted also most effectually the development of civilization. For not only did she abolish the laws of barbarous nations and remodel on more humane lines their savage customs, but likewise, with God's assistance, she reformed and brought to Christian perfection the very law of the Romans, that wonderful monument of ancient wisdom which is deservedly styled *ratio scripta*, so as to have at hand, as the rules of public and private life improved, abundant material both for medieval and modern legislation.

With inevitable changes nevertheless in the conditions of the times and in the needs of men, as our predecessor, Pius X of happy memory, pointed out in the *Motu Proprio Arduum sane*, issued 17 March, 1904, it became apparent that Canon Law could no longer readily attain the fulness of its aims. Indeed in the passing of centuries many, many laws had been published, of which some had been abrogated by the supreme authority of the Church or had fallen into desuetude; whilst others, owing to changed conditions, had become difficult of execution, or less useful and expedient for the common good. Moreover these laws had so increased in number and were so separated one from another and scattered about that many of them were unknown not merely to the people at large, but even to the most learned.

For these reasons our predecessor, Pius X of happy memory, immediately on his accession to the Pontificate, realizing how helpful it would be for the stable restoration of ecclesiastical discipline to put an end to the serious inconveniences above referred to, resolved to arrange in a clear and orderly collection all the laws of the Church which had been proclaimed down to our day, abolishing those already abrogated or obsolete, adapting others to present needs and making new ones as necessity or expediency should require.¹ Setting about this most difficult task after mature deliberation, he considered it

¹ Cf. *Motu proprio Arduum sane*.

necessary to consult the bishops *whom the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God*, so as to know fully their mind on this matter; and first of all he caused the Cardinal Secretary of State to write letters to all the archbishops of the Catholic world, charging them to interrogate their suffragans, and other Ordinaries, who are obliged to assist at provincial synods, if there were any such, and to inform the Holy See with as little delay as possible and briefly concerning the modifications and corrections which in their opinion might be especially necessary in the present laws of the Church.²

Then, having summoned several canonists of note, resident in Rome and elsewhere, to lend their aid, he committed to our beloved son Cardinal Gasparri, who was at that time Archbishop of Ceserea, the office of directing, perfecting, and, if need be, supplementing the work of the Consultors. He moreover formed a committee or, as it is called, a *Commission* of Cardinals of the Holy Roman Church, appointing as its members Cardinals Dominic Ferrata, Casimir Genari, Benjamin Cavicchioni, Joseph Calasanctius Vives y Tuto, and Felix Cavagnis, who with Cardinal Gasparri as *ponens*, were to examine diligently the proposed canons, and modify, correct, or perfect them as their judgment might suggest.³ On the death, one after another, of these five, their places were taken by our beloved sons, Cardinals Vincent Vannutelli, Cajetan de Lai, Sebastian Martinelli, Basil Pompili, Cajetan Bisleti, William Van Rossum, Philip Gius-tini, and Michael Lega, who have admirably completed the work imposed upon them.

Lastly, seeking once more the prudence and authority of all the brethren of the Episcopate, he directed that to each of them and to all superiors of Religious Orders who are legitimately invited to an ecumenical council, a copy of the new Code, compiled and corrected, should be sent before its promulgation, in order that they might freely express their views in regard to the canons as prepared.⁴

In the meantime, however, to the sorrow of the whole Catholic world, our predecessor of immortal memory passed from this life, and it devolved on us, as by the secret council of God we entered on the Pontificate, to receive with due honor the opinions, coming from every quarter of the world, of those who with us constitute the teaching Church. Finally we ratified, approved and sanctioned in all its parts the new Code of the whole of Canon Law, which was asked for by many bishops in the Vatican Council, and which was begun over twelve years ago.

² Cf. *Epistolam Pergratum mihi*, 25 March, 1904.

³ Cf. *Motu proprio Arduum sane*.

⁴ Cf. *Epistolam De Mandato*, 20 March, 1912.

Therefore, having sought the aid of Divine grace, trusting in the authority of the Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, *motu proprio*, of our certain knowledge and in the fulness of the Apostolic power with which we are invested, by this our constitution, which we wish to be binding for all time, we promulgate, and we decree and order that the present Code, just as it is drawn up, have in future the force of law for the universal Church, and we entrust it for safe-keeping to your custody and vigilance.

That all concerned, however, may have full knowledge of the prescripts of this Code before they become effective, we decree and ordain that they shall not have the force of law till Pentecost of next year, that is, on the nineteenth day of May, 1918.

All enactments, constitutions and privileges whatsoever, even those worthy of special and individual mention, and customs, even immemorial, and all other things whatsoever to the contrary notwithstanding.

Wherefore let no one violate or rashly oppose in any way this document of our constitution, ordinance, limitation, suppression, derogation, and expressed will. And if any one shall presume to attempt to do so, let him know that he will incur the wrath of Almighty God and of his Blessed Apostles Peter and Paul.

Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, on the Feast of Pentecost, in the year nineteen hundred and seventeen, the third of our Pontificate.

PETER CARDINAL GASPARRI,

Secretary of State.

O. CARDINAL CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO,

Chancellor of the Holy Roman Church.

CONTENTS AND DIVISION OF THE NEW CODE.

In the new Codex the Bull of promulgation is immediately followed by the Act of Faith of Pius V, with the addition authorized by Pius IX, with which we are familiar, and which must be made under certain prescribed circumstances by various ecclesiastics. Later a preface by Cardinal Gasparri is expected. Then begins the Codex proper, which comprises 456 octavo pages and is divided into 2414 canons. Certain constitutions follow that are not new, particularly concerning the government of the Church while the Roman See is vacant, and the election of a Pope. Finally there is a brief general index.

The idea of publishing the entire legislation of the Church in canons is not new. It was adopted some years ago by Monsignor Pezzani, a professor in the Vatican Seminary, who

in 1894 began to publish in this form, with copious explanatory notes, a work that he styled *Codex Sanctae Catholicae Romanae Ecclesiae*. The setting forth of legislation in distinct decrees lends itself to conciseness and clearness.

The ancient division of Canon Law into three parts, introduced by Gratian in the twelfth century and so commonly followed in our text books, has been abandoned, the present Codex being made up of five books, though the old order or method of treatment remains practically the same.

In the first book are found certain preliminaries or general ideas, termed *Normae Generales*. Then follow under separate titles fundamental notions on law in general, customs, rescripts, privileges, and dispensations. The third title, on the method of computing time in years, months and days, as required in the application of canon law, contains some details that are new, though much of the matter has been made up of previous decrees. In the *Normae generales*, which are only seven in number, we are reminded of the canonical principle that the legislation of the Latin Church does not necessarily extend to the Oriental Church. Liturgical regulations, we are informed, are not professedly treated in the new codification, and those now in vogue retain their force, except where the present Code may state the contrary. Thus the musical regulations of Pius X, while still in force, are not embodied in the Codex. Special pacts or concordats between the Holy See and civil powers are not affected. The same is true of privileges or indults now enjoyed, owing to the favor of the Holy See, by individuals or associations, where they have not been specially revoked. Canon five speaks of the effect of the new legislation on present legitimate *customs*, whether particular or universal, while the next number, which is especially specific or detailed, treats similarly of the cessation or abrogation of present *laws*. The last General Rule assures us that ordinarily the appellation *Apostolic See* or *Holy See* embraces, as well as His Holiness, the Roman Congregations, Tribunals, and Offices, which assist in ruling the universal Church.

The second book or division of the Code treats of persons ("De Personis"), the third of things ("De Rebus"), the fourth of processes ("De Processibus"), and finally the fifth, of crimes and punishments ("De Delictis et Poenis").

The fourth book is subdivided into three parts, which treat of trials ("De judiciis"), the process or formalities to be observed in preparing for the beatification or canonization of saints ("De Causis beatificationis Servorum Dei et canonizationis Beatorum"), processes in special cases ("De modo procedendi in nonnullis expediendis negotiis vel sanctionibus poenalibus applicandis").

The fifth book is made up also of three parts, in which we find the legislation respectively on crimes ("De Delictis"), punishments in general ("De Poenis"), and punishments that are applicable in particular cases ("De Poenis in singula delicta").

The fourth and fifth books of the Codex occupy 156 pages and 863 canons, or nearly one-third of the entire volume. The former legislation of the Church in the matter contained in these parts has been modified to some extent, while some new material and many details have been added.

Naturally the portions of the Codex that especially attract our interest are the second and third books, which, we may add in passing, are extremely orderly. The second book, after a few general statements, treats of clerics specifically, namely of the Pope, the Cardinals, and so on in order, of Religious, of the laity. The third book, after a few general decrees, takes up the Sacraments, treating each in turn, then passes on to sacred places and times ("De locis et temporibus sacris"). The third part of this section is occupied with Divine cult ("De cultu divino"), the fourth with preaching, catechising, teaching, and the like ("De Magisterio ecclesiastico"), the fifth with benefices and other associations ("De beneficiis aliisque institutis ecclesiasticis non collegialibus"), and finally the sixth with temporal goods ("De bonis Ecclesiae temporalibus"). While in these second and third books of the Codex the changes are not for the most part drastic, yet many occur. Let us direct attention to some of the more important.

NEW LEGISLATION.

A person who has reached the age of twenty-one is a *major*; under that age, a *minor*. A *diocesan* domicile, as was held by many canonists, is possible. A person consequently may move

about in a diocese from parish to parish, not remaining long enough in any one to acquire a *parochial* domicile, and yet retain a canonical domicile in the diocese. A domicile may be acquired by a residence of ten years without further formalities, a quasi-domicile by the mere fact of a residence of more than six months. The pastor of those who have merely a diocesan, not parochial, domicile or quasi-domicile is the rector of the parish in which those persons reside at the moment. Canon 97 is most important, since it changes radically the definition of affinity: "Affinitas oritur ex matrimonio *valido* sive rato tantum sive rato et consummato." The chapter on the obligations of clerics removes all possibility of discussion. Canon 120 specifies that the permission required to cite a cleric into a civil court is that of the bishop of the place where the court sits ("venia Ordinarii loci in quo causa peragitur"). Under the caption *De reductione clericorum ad statum laicalem* we find among other things: "Clericus major qui ad statum laicalem rediit, ut inter clericos denuo admittatur, indiget Sanctae Sedis licentia" (can. 212, § 2).

All *dioceses* are divided into parishes ("paroeciae"), strictly so called in canonical parlance; *Vicariates and Prefectures Apostolic* into *quasi-parishes* or missions (can. 216). This fact constitutes a monumental change in the canonical status of the rectors of our churches, who now become *parochi* with all rights and obligations accordingly. These rights and duties, however, as we shall see later, have undergone various modifications. While parishes with definite territorial boundaries alone are canonical, so-called national parishes merit some recognition, especially when already established, as the subjoined quotation will show: "Non possunt sine speciali apostolico indulto constitui paroeciae pro diversitate sermonis seu nationis fidelium in eadem civitate vel territorio degentium, nec paroeciae mere familiares aut personales; ad *constitutas* autem quod attinet, *nihil innovandum*, inconsulta Apostolica Sede" (can. 216 § 4). The division of a diocese into deaneries is prescribed, unless the Holy See in particular cases decide otherwise.

The privileges of Cardinals are mentioned in detail. It is stated that no one may be created Cardinal who is related in the first or second degree of consanguinity to one already in

the Sacred College. Less than seven pages are devoted in the Codex to the Roman Congregations, Tribunals, and Offices. We note, as was announced some months ago, the suppression of the Congregation of the Index, the Holy Office assuming its work, also the establishment of a separate Congregation for Oriental affairs; while the Congregation of Seminaries and Universities appears with its new title. Under the Holy Office the following appears: "*Ipsa una competens est circa ea omnia quae jejunium eucharisticum pro sacerdotibus Missam celebrantibus respiciunt.*" All legates *a latere*, Nuntios, Internuntios or Apostolic Delegates may pontificate *outside cathedral churches*, using throne and crozier, *without the Ordinary's permission.*

PRIMATES AND METROPOLITANS.

Persistent investigation has failed to reveal in the Codex any mention of the cross which is born before patriarchs, primates, and archbishops. The practice, which prevails in many places, of having a double transverse bar on a *metropolitan* cross, was seemingly contrary to the law. A positive statement concerning this question was expected in the new Codex. Formerly an archbishop could make a canonical visitation of a suffragan's see only for reasons approved in a provincial synod, and then only after having finished a like visitation of his own diocese. That an archbishop may now visit canonically a suffragan's territory, negligence on the part of the suffragan to make such visitation is necessary, and the Holy See must have passed upon the matter. Further concessions than before are extended to archbishops who have not yet received the *pallium*. Decree 276 reads thus: "*Quare ante pallii impositionem, excluso speciali indulto apostolico, ipse illicite ponerat actus sive jurisdictionis metropolitanae, sive ordinis episcopalis in quibus ad normam legum liturgicarum, usus pallii requiritur.*" Regulations governing the use of the *pallium* remain the same.

COUNCILS.

A provincial council is to be held at least every twenty years, a diocesan synod once in ten years at least. A plenary council remains, of course, subject to the call of the Pope. Diocesan bishops may send their coadjutor or auxiliary to a plenary

council in their stead. Titular bishops must attend the plenary council and ordinarily enjoy therein a decisive vote. Titular bishops who assist at a provincial synod may, with the consent of the synod, be granted a similar vote. The old legislation declared that titular bishops *who did not possess jurisdiction*, might be granted this honor: which restriction or limitation is now withdrawn. Those to whom the law gives a decisive vote in either a plenary or provincial council, may, if inability to attend is proved, appoint a substitute. This substitute, as such, has no vote, enjoying merely a right to his *own* vote, if this belong to him by law. Like regulations in regard to voting by substitutes prevail in an ecumenical council (can. 224). No one has a double vote in any council. The Codex admits what practice centuries ago had introduced, namely, that an individual bishop may in his own territory grant a dispensation for just reasons from the decrees of a plenary or provincial council.

BISHOPS AND THEIR CURIA.

The canonical age for the episcopate remains at thirty. The doctorate or licentiate in Theology or Canon Law for this office is not insisted on. Sweeping changes in regard to the duties, rights or privileges of bishops are not, of course, possible in the new legislation. A canonical visitation of his diocese in all its parts is incumbent upon a bishop at least every five years. This duty must be performed by the vicar general or other delegate, if the bishop personally is unable to attend to it. In this connexion we read: "*circa vero victualia sibi suisque ministranda vel procurationes et expensas itineris, servetur legitima locorum consuetudo*" (can. 346). The diocesan curia is composed of all who assist in administering the affairs of the whole diocese: "*Quare ad eam pertinent Vicarius Generalis, officialis, cancellarius, promotor iustitiæ, defensor vinculi, synodales iudices et examinatores, parochi consultores, auditores, notarii, cursores et apparitores*" (can. 363). A vicar general should be at least thirty years old, belong to the secular clergy, and not be related in the first degree of consanguinity to the bishop of the diocese. If, however, the bishop is a Religious, he may select a member of the same order or congregation as his vicar general. Ordinarily there is only

one vicar general in a diocese. Difference of rites or excess of work may permit more. A substitute may supply when the regular incumbent is absent or unable to act. "Cancellarius est eo ipso notarius. Poscente necessitate, adiutor ei dari potest, cui nomen sit vice-cancellarii seu vice-tabularii" (can. 372). The work of the notary or notaries, since more than one is allowed, is described in canon 374. The notary or clerk in criminal clerical trials must be a priest; in other cases laymen may act. Regulations are laid down for the custody of the diocesan archives, public and secret, "sede episcopali sive plena sive vacante." Synodal examiners and parish priest consultors hold office from one diocesan synod to another, or, where no synod intervenes, for *ten* years, since such synods need not be held, according to the new law, except every ten years.

CHAPTERS AND DIOCESAN CONSULTORS.

The eight pages on cathedral and collegiate chapters, which have not been introduced into the United States, need not detain us. Where cathedral chapters do not exist, diocesan consultors are of obligation. Our Third Plenary Council of Baltimore has seemingly furnished the foundation and some of the details for this legislation. These consultors ordinarily should number six, and only where priests are scarce will four suffice. They must be residents of the episcopal city or of its neighborhood, so that they may be at hand when needed. They are selected *solely by the bishop* for a term of three years. At the expiration of this term the bishop reappoints the same consultors or selects one or more new ones, as he may see fit. If however *during* any of these triennial periods a vacancy occur, the bishop in completing the required number must seek the advice of the remaining consultors, as has been in vogue in the United States. Those thus chosen go out of office with the others when their term expires. Should the episcopal see be vacant at the expiration of the three-year term in question, the consultors continue in office till the new incumbent within six months after his installation makes his selection. A new feature in the matter is the selection of a consultor or consultors *during the vacancy of the see* to fill up the requisite number. The selection is made by the vicar capitular, or, for us, by the administrator with a majority vote ("de consensu aliorum con-

sultorum ") of the consultors remaining. Consultors chosen under such circumstances cannot act after the accession of the new bishop unless the selection is confirmed by him. All consultors, under oath, must promise faithful service.

We must insist on the force of canon 427: "Coetus consultorum dioecesanorum *vices Capituli cathedralis*, qua Episcopi senatus, *supplet*; quare quae canones ad gubernationem dioecesis, sive sede plena sive ea impedita aut vacante. Capitulo cathedrali tribuunt, ea de coetu quoque consultorum dioecesanorum intelligenda sunt." Our diocesan consultors consequently assume all the rights and obligations in the administration of the diocese, whether the see is filled or vacant, that belong to the cathedral chapter. To the consultors, then, among other rights and duties, *it would seem*, belongs that of electing by majority vote the administrator of a vacant see. The selection with us formerly was made by the bishop before his death, or, if he failed to do so, it devolved on the archbishop. These temporary appointments were subject to papal approval. If a diocese became vacant for reasons other than death, it was the metropolitan's place to select the administrator. A vicar capitular, and consequently an administrator, we believe, of a vacant see, has the same obligation as the bishop of applying Mass for the faithful on all Sundays and feast days, even though suppressed (can. 440).

PARISH PRIESTS.

While it is the mind of the Church that parish priests should be appointed for life, it is not essential. This mitigation of the law is evident in the present Code. Parishes where pastors are *permanent*, can not lose this feature without permission of the Holy See, while to *other* parishes bishops, with the advice of the cathedral chapter, or of the consultors with us, may grant permanent pastors. As regards parishes that may later be erected, their rectors are irremovable, unless the bishop with the cathedral chapter, owing to peculiar conditions, judge this to be inadvisable. All this applies in the United States, since those in charge of our churches are now *parochi*. An examination, not competitive, is prescribed for appointment to a parish. This however may be dispensed with, if the examiners consent, "si agatur de sacerdote doctrinae theologiae

laude commendato" (can. 459). The concursus or competitive examination, where now prescribed, will continue, till the Holy See decide otherwise. A parish priest may not preside over more than one parish, "nisi de paroeiis agatur aequae principaliter unitis" (can. 460), where namely the parishes remain distinct, each with equal rights. As far then as this feature is concerned, the status of our priests who look after the welfare of two or more parishes, remains unaltered. The law of residence naturally is insisted on. Written permission of the Ordinary must be obtained by a parish priest, if he would absent himself for more than a week from his parish. If the cause of departure suddenly arise and the absence is to extend beyond a week, the bishop must be notified by letter and acquainted with the circumstances involved (can. 465). Our pastors henceforth will have the obligation *ex justitia* of applying Mass on all Sundays and holidays, actually observed or suppressed. Those who are in charge of more than one parish will satisfy this obligation by offering one Mass on the prescribed days. Some modification has been made in the application of this regulation. The Ordinary may permit for suitable reasons the offering of this Mass of obligation on a day other than the one laid down in the law. While ordinarily it is said in the parochial church, yet it may, if this is inconvenient, be offered elsewhere; and when the pastor is legitimately absent, he may say it himself, or have it offered by his substitute in the parish church. Moral Theology does not allow a stipend, except on Christmas, for a second mass said by a parish priest on one of these days.

All pastors, and other priests as well, may by reason of the general law, impart the papal blessing with a plenary indulgence *in articulo mortis* (can. 468). Confirmation, subdeaconship and solemn profession in Religion, as well as marriages contracted, are to be noted in the baptismal register. These too should be mentioned in a baptismal certificate when granted. "In fine cujuslibet anni parochus authenticum exemplar (*copy*) librorum paroeialium ad Curiam episcopalem transmittat, excepto libro de statu animarum" (can. 470, § 3). As has ever been the practice in this country, the bishop, not the pastors, are to select the assistants: "Non ad parochum, sed ad loci Ordinarium, *audito parocho*, competit jus nominandi vicarios

cooperatores e clero saeculari." The bishop too will determine the number of assistants necessary (can. 476). Priests presiding over churches that are not parochial, or collegiate, or connected with Religious houses, are styled *rectors*.

RELIGIOUS.

In the forty pages of the Code allotted to their affairs, Religious will find much to interest them. We shall touch upon a few points only. All terms, with which we are familiar in this matter, are clearly defined, while the canonical regulations governing the erection and suppression of a congregation, province or community, the duties and rights of superiors and chapters or councils, together with the administration of temporal possessions, are set forth in order. Much is said of the novitiate, profession, confessions, studies of Religious clerics, obligations and privileges, dismissal, or voluntary abandonment of the community. Male and female congregations are treated, and there is a chapter also concerning those who without vows lead a community life. Let us note the following: "Caveant Superiores ne quem subditum aut ipsi per se aut per alium vi, metu, importunis suasionibus aliave ratione inducant ut peccata apud se confiteantur" (can. 518, § 3). "*Omnes religiosi Superiores districte vetantur personas sibi subditas quoquo modo inducere ad conscientiae manifestationem sibi peragendam*" (can. 530). This applies to male, as well as to female, Religious. Another canon (891) is also applicable here: "Magister novitiorum ejusque socius, Superior seminarii collegiive sacramentales confessiones suorum alumnorum secum in eadem domo commorantium ne audeat, nisi alumni ex gravi et urgenti causa in casibus particularibus sponte id petant." These and other decrees manifest the desire of the Church to safeguard the liberty of conscience of all.

A year's novitiate is absolutely necessary for the validity of a Religious profession. If a novice through necessity or with permission is absent from the novitiate not more than thirty days all told, it is sufficient to make up this time. Where under similar conditions the absence has not extended beyond fifteen days, the time may be supplied, but this is not necessary for the validity of the subsequent profession. Where there are two classes of members in an order, a novitiate made with the

expectation of entering one of these will not suffice for the other. In all orders, male or female, perpetual vows must be preceded by simple vows of three years duration, or longer if age of candidate so require, unless particular constitutions demand annual vows. The vote of the council for temporary vows is decisive; for perpetual vows merely consultative. A Religious may not be excluded from final profession merely for reasons of health except where the physical weakness is proved to have been fraudulently concealed before profession of temporary vows. *Presumptive* incardination of an ex-Religious into a diocese may hold in certain specified cases (can. 641, § 2), though, in general, formal or documentary incorporation alone is recognized in law. An ex-Religious is excluded from certain defined positions or offices (can. 642). A Religious who after the expiration of temporary vows has left a community, or who by reason of an indult has been *secularized*, or dismissed, has no pecuniary claims in justice for any work whatsoever performed while in religion, though charitable considerations, in some instances, may be binding (can. 643). Stringent formalities are established for the dismissal of Religious, particularly after they have taken perpetual vows, either simple or solemn, "in religione *clericali aut non*," the details of which would not interest the general reader.

LAITY.

Eight pages of the Code are devoted to lay persons. Their right to receive spiritual aid, in accordance with ecclesiastical discipline, from the clergy is established. The clerical dress is not for them, except in so far as they may be seminarists, or while actually employed about the church as sacristans, singers, or the like. The remainder of the matter under this head is occupied with the rights of the laity and the method of forming associations with a canonical or judicial standing. Minute details are given concerning the establishment, membership, administration and suppression of such associations. Archconfraternities, Confraternities, Pious Unions and Tertiaries enjoy special treatment.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

A. B. MEEHAN.

St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

CHANGES MADE BY THE NEW CODE OF CANON LAW.

THE entire Catholic Church is rejoiced at the happy event of the promulgation of the new Codex of Canon Law. The Bull of approval is dated Whitsunday, 27 May, 1917, and it provides that the new law shall go into effect on Whitsunday, 19 May, 1918. The length of time allowed for a new law to enter into force after its official promulgation is known in the language of canon law as the "*vacatio legis*". It used to be conceded by canonists that for all laws published by the Holy See two months were allowed before they became of force in places outside the City of Rome. For very remote countries even more time was given in order to get the knowledge of the new law sufficiently circulated for its enforcement. In more recent times the Holy See has specified the period of the "*vacatio legis*" in important laws. The general principle, however, stands, in civil law as well as in laws of the Church, that the subjects have to exert themselves to find out through the ordinary channels of information, for instance, the official magazines and papers, what laws, amendments, decisions, etc., have been passed. It is not necessary, then, that the bishop announce to the clergy the laws and regulations made by the supreme authority of the Church, nor can it be said that this is his duty, though for uniformity of action on the part of the clergy of a diocese it is advantageous that the bishop announce important new laws and direct the clergy to make these known to the people on the same day throughout the diocese.

The new Codex is a monumental work, which has taken thirteen years of untiring labor by a large number of the best scholars of canon law. Those who are even in a slight degree familiar with the study of canon law understand what a gigantic task it was to collect and coördinate the existing laws, and to eliminate those that have dropped out of use or have been revoked in the course of many centuries. Never before was such a work on the same wide basis attempted. Various Popes in the Middle Ages got up official collections of laws enacted within a limited period of years, but never before was the entire legislation unified and codified as has been done in the volume now issued.

The purpose of this new collection of laws is to supersede all existing collections of Papal laws, whether contained in the several official compilations published with the special approval of former Popes, or in the volumes of decrees and declarations published by the various Roman Congregations, or finally, the many private collections of Papal laws. Only in those instances where the Codex expressly declares that a former law on such or such a point is to be retained are former laws held to be in force. Particulars of this kind will be discussed in a future number of the REVIEW.

The benefit of the Codex is inestimable, and will go far toward unifying and strengthening the activities of the Church by effecting a more uniform course of action in all the important details of the Church's life. No one, however, should labor under the impression that the Codex means that the legislation of the Supreme Head of the Church has come to a stop. An organization like the Catholic Church, living and working in the great wide world and guiding millions of people from all nations in the ways of truth, must needs adapt her work to the ever changing conditions of peoples and times. The present Codex, therefore, is not to be the final law in all and everything, seeing that canon law is the regulation of the activities of the Church, which activities are constantly going on and developing with the gradual evolution of civilization. Fresh amendments, decisions, and declarations concerning the meaning of some of the laws, and exceptions and particular regulations made necessary by peculiar circumstances in different countries or dioceses must naturally be expected.

A few new and special features of the Codex may be mentioned here, leaving a more extended and systematic treatment for subsequent numbers of the REVIEW.

In the first place the canonist will notice a difference of arrangement of matter from that of former collections of canon law. The five books used to follow the order of "judex, judicium, clerus, connubia, crimen," while the five books or divisions of the new volume are: Lib. I. Normae generales; Lib. II. De Personis; Lib. III. De Rebus; Lib. IV. De Processibus; Lib. V. De Delictis et Poenis. Reference to the laws has been made easy by short canons or paragraphs num-

bered consecutively from the beginning to the end of the volume, so that the number of the canon suffices to enable one to find the law referred to, no matter in what book or under what title the law may stand.

Canon 6 ordains that all previous laws, whether universal or particular, that are opposed to the laws of the Codex are abolished, unless the Codex makes express allowance for particular laws, as is done repeatedly in the course of the volume.

Canon 44 states that if anyone, having asked a dispensation or favor from the Vicar General and having been refused, asks the same of the bishop without stating that the Vicar General has refused the request, the granting of the dispensation or favor by the bishop is null and void.

Canon 135 explicitly rules that the clergy in major orders are bound to recite daily the Divine Office. This is the first written general law on the subject, for, as is well known, the obligation of saying the Divine Office was introduced by custom.

Canon 216 ordains that the area of each diocese be divided into definite territorial portions or districts. For the Catholic population of each district there shall be assigned a parish church, and a priest shall govern the district as its proper pastor and take charge of the care of souls therein. Without a special indult of the Holy See, parishes for the faithful of different languages or nations in the same district or town shall not be established, nor parishes that are merely for a family or for certain individuals. Where such parishes are in existence at present, nothing is to be changed without consulting the Holy See.

By canon 465 pastors are allowed a vacation of two months, either continuous or interrupted; but whenever they go away for more than a week, they must inform the bishop and provide a priest for the care of the parish.

Canon 755 concedes the bishops the right to allow, for a grave reason, the use of the formula for the baptism of infants in the baptism of adults.

Canon 768 limits the impediment of spiritual relationship arising from baptism to the person baptized, the one baptizing, and the sponsor or sponsors. It therefore does away with the relationship of the sponsors and the one baptizing to the parents of the baptized.

Canon 805 settles a question very much agitated by moralists, viz. whether a priest is bound by reason of his priesthood to say Holy Mass at all, or at least several times a year. The present canon states that all priests are bound to say Holy Mass several times a year ("pluries per annum").

Canon 858 extends the privilege of people who have been sick for a month to receive Holy Communion without fasting to once or twice a week, while the former regulations allowed them to receive only once or twice a month, unless they lived in houses where the Blessed Sacrament was reserved.

Canon 891 forbids the master of novices and his socius, or the superior of a college or seminary to hear the confessions of their subjects, unless in a grave and urgent case an alumnus should of his own accord ask them to hear his confession.

Canon 931. The faithful who are accustomed to go to confession at least twice a month, or who receive Holy Communion daily or nearly so, can gain all indulgences without previous confession, even though confession is one of the necessary conditions for gaining the indulgence. Only the Jubilee indulgences and those granted after the manner of a Jubilee indulgence are excepted.

Canon 947 settles the dispute concerning the administration of Extreme Unction in cases where it was given with one anointing. While the law was plain enough that the one anointing was sufficient for validity, it was not so clear whether, if the person lived, the full rite of the anointing, as in the Roman Ritual, had to be observed. This canon makes it obligatory to anoint all the senses if there is time to do so.

Canon 976 and those following it make several new regulations concerning candidates for ordination. Can. 976 orders that no one, whether secular or religious, be admitted to first tonsure until he has taken up the course of theology. Subdeaconship may not be conferred until the end of the third year of theology; deaconship, not until the beginning of the fourth year, and priesthood only after the first half of the fourth year has been completed.

Canon 1067. In this and succeeding canons there are several important new regulations concerning the diriment impediments of marriage. Can. 1067 declares a young man under sixteen years of age and a girl under fourteen in-

capable of contracting a valid marriage. Can. 1076 limits blood relationship of the collateral line to the third degree inclusive; affinity is also limited to the second degree inclusive, without distinction as to whether affinity arises from lawful wedlock or sinful intercourse. In Canon 1078 the impediment called "public honesty" is so far modified that there is no longer any diriment impediment arising from valid marriage engagements or from a *matrimonium ratum*. But a diriment impediment arises to the second degree inclusive in the direct line between the blood relations of the man, and also of the woman, from an invalid marriage, whether consummated or not, and from public and notorious concubinage.

Canon 1080, concerning the *cognatio legalis* or relationship from legal adoption, rules that, whenever the State inhibits parties to marry on account of relationship by adoption, such parties are also by canon law debarred from contracting valid marriage. In order to be informed, therefore, whether such an impediment exists and how far it extends, priests will have to know on this point the statute law of the State in which they assist at marriage.

Canon 1096 modifies the *Ne temere* decree in an important point. If the pastor wishes to delegate a priest who is not one of the assistant priests of the parish, to perform the marriage ceremony, the pastor is required to specify not only the priest but also the marriage for which he delegates him. Under pain of nullity, general delegation is forbidden. Canon 1098 makes another amendment to the *Ne temere*—in danger of death marriage may be validly and licitly entered into before two witnesses only; the same holds true even when danger of death is not in question, if it can be prudently foreseen that within the space of a month neither bishop nor pastor nor a priest delegated by either can be called or approached without serious inconvenience. In either case, if there is another priest (not delegated) who could assist at the marriage, he must be called in order that he may officiate, together with the witnesses; but the marriage is valid so long as the witnesses are present.

Canons 1138 and 1139, concerning *sanatio in radice* of marriages, are important. Can. 1138 declares that the dispensation *in radice*, together with the dispensation from renewal

of the consent, can be granted even if both of the parties are unaware of the invalidity of the marriage. Can. 1139 reads: "A marriage entered into with such mutual consent as would naturally be sufficient, but which is invalid on account of a canonical impediment, or on account of the non-observance of the requisite form, can be validated by a *sanatio in radice*, provided the consent perseveres."

Canon 1251 abolishes the prohibition not to partake of fish and flesh at the same meal on a fast day. Canon 1252 gives a list of the days of fast and abstinence. They are practically the same as we have had in the United States by indult. Here also is to be noted the ruling that the Lenten fast comes to a close at midday of Holy Saturday. Canon 1253 states that, until further orders, nothing is to be changed concerning the observance of fast and abstinence in countries where they are regulated by special indult of the Holy See.

Canon 1305 states that the chalice and paten do not lose consecration by being worn or by being regilded. Many canonists held that the chalice and paten, after replating, had to be consecrated over again and a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites had required that they be consecrated again by the bishop.

Canon 1308. There are two private vows reserved to the Holy See, namely, that of perfect and perpetual chastity and that of joining a religious Order professing solemn vows, provided the professor of the vow had passed his eighteenth year of age at the time he made the vow.

Canon 1990. In cases of marriage contracted invalidly by reason of the following impediments, disparity of cult, Sacred Orders, solemn vow of chastity, prior marriage bond, consanguinity, affinity, and spiritual relationship, bishops have power to declare the marriage null and void without observing the formalities of a canonical trial. It is necessary, however, that the existence of the impediment be proved beyond a reasonable doubt by some unquestionably authentic document, that the bishop cite the parties and have the *defensor vinculi* intervene.

Canon 2157 and succeeding canons speak of the removal of pastors or rectors of churches who have not the right of inamovibility. It is against the law to remove such a pastor

against his will, unless he has failed in his duties by grave neglect or otherwise proved himself unfit to rule a parish. The removal is lawful, however, Canon 2162 states, if the parish to which the pastor is to be transferred is not too inferior to the one from which he is removed. But even in this case certain formalities, given in Canons 2164 and the following, must be observed by the bishop—for instance, he must hear two of the parochial consultors on the question of removal.

FR. STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M.

Paterson, New Jersey.

THE NEW REGULATIONS ON PREACHING.

IT is not often that we find the subject matter of an Encyclical Letter of the Pope made the object of legislation by one of the Roman Congregations. We have, however, a very recent example of it in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* of 2 July of this year.

On the feast of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, 15 June, the Sovereign Pontiff issued an Encyclical Letter on preaching,¹ and on the vigil of the feast of the Apostles Saints Peter and Paul, the Sacred Congregation of the Consistory issued a decree² on the same subject. This decree, published with the full approval of His Holiness, is nothing else than a practical application of the teaching of the Holy Father and contains certain regulations which Ordinaries are to observe in this important matter and which His Holiness has ordered to be carried out at once. The decree states its purpose to be that "the ministry of the Word" may produce those fruits looking to the defence and propagation of the Christian faith and the safeguarding of the Christian life which the Divine Teacher Himself had in view and which the Catholic Church rightly promises to herself.³

The Encyclical must naturally serve as an introduction to the better understanding of the objects aimed at by the decree. In it the Pope reveals his apostolic solicitude on the subject

¹ See *Analecta* of this number, pp. 399-410.

² *Idem*, pp. 410-417.

³ Cf. the Pope's program in the Encyclical: "Ut praedicationem divini verbi ad eam normam, ad quam Christi Domini jussu Ecclesiaeque statutis dirigenda est, ubique revocemus."

of preaching. He tells us that in the scheme of Divine Providence the preaching of Christian wisdom is a divinely appointed means to continue the work of eternal salvation, that it is rightly reckoned amongst the greatest and most serious matters, calling for his especial care and thought, particularly so, as it seems to some extent to have fallen away from its early vigor, to the detriment of its efficacy. He laments the disregard and forgetfulness of the supernatural in the modern world, the gradual departure from the strictness of Christian virtue, and the ever-increasing tendency to adopt pagan standards of living. These evils the Pope attributes in part to preachers who neglect to supply sufficient antidotes.

Nor are we left in doubt as to the particular abuses which the decree sets about remedying. The Holy Father has portrayed them tellingly in the Encyclical. The same august writer prescribes the remedies, but the importance of the subject drew forth from the Sacred Consistorial Congregation more detailed and more precise legislation.

These abuses are, first of all, the assumption on the part of many of the office of preaching without proper warrant. Of not a few preachers, writes the Pope, is the plaint of the Lord verified: "*Non mittebam prophetas, et ipsi currebant*" (Jeremias 23: 21). In a vigorous phrase he compares the pulpit to the wrestling-school of the ancients, into which anyone might thrust himself and disport himself at will. He reminds bishops that it is their duty to take action against perversity so great, and that they are to render an account to God and to the Church of the food supplied to their flocks. The bishop is the official preacher. Others may preach only when called and approved by him. Accordingly, the first chapter of the decree lays down that he who is to preach to the faithful in a public church or oratory requires the special faculty of the bishop of the diocese. It specifies by whom, in various circumstances, and in what manner, this faculty is to be requested; how the bishop is to satisfy himself as to the fitness to preach of a candidate who is not his subject; and finally, leaves to the judgment of the bishop the punishments to be inflicted on those who transgress this law.

The preacher should not merely be deputed by the bishop, but he should also be fitted for this work. The Council of

Trent, says the Encyclical, gives the bishop permission to choose as his substitutes only the competent, that is to say, those who can fulfil the office of preaching to the spiritual profit of their hearers. As proofs of a divine call are necessary before one may be admitted to the priesthood, so proofs of a divine vocation for this work are necessary before one may be admitted to preach. The second section of the decree informs the bishop how he is to satisfy himself as to the fitness to preach of those of his subjects whom he intends for this work of the ministry.

The third chapter sets forth what is to be observed or avoided in sacred preaching. The Encyclical had already drawn attention to some of these, *v. g.* the vainglory of many preachers, the treating in the pulpit of profane matters and even of politics, unrestrained and unbecoming gesture more in keeping with the stage or the platform, citation from the writings of unbelievers and non-Catholics, neglect to preach certain divinely revealed truths because they are apt to weary the audience or terrify them, etc., etc.

Some will not possess the gifts which fit them for this duty, and hence the fourth chapter treats of those to whom the office of preaching is to be denied and how the bishop is to proceed in such cases.

The fifth and last section deals with the remote preparation for the ministry of preaching.

These preliminary considerations will help us to understand better the decree itself.

CHAPTER I.

BY WHOM AND IN WHAT MANNER PREACHERS OF THE WORD OF GOD ARE TO BE CHOSEN.

1. Ordinaries are reminded first of all that the Council of Trent, having laid down that the duty of preaching is the peculiar province of bishops, enacted (*Cap. IV, Sess. 24, de Reform.*) that the Sacred Scriptures and the Divine Law should be announced by the bishops themselves in their own churches, or, the bishops themselves being lawfully hindered, by those whom the bishops appoint to the office of preaching. In other churches, this duty is to be discharged by the parish priests of such churches, or, these being hindered, by others

deputed by the bishops. This duty is to be fulfilled at least on Sundays and on the more solemn feasts, and, where not discharged by the bishop or the parish priest, it is to be fulfilled at the expense of those on whom law or custom has imposed this burden. Moreover, no one, whether secular or regular, even in churches of their orders, should presume to preach against the wishes of the bishop ("contradicente Episcopo").

This is clearly confirmed in the new ecclesiastical Code, canons 1327, 1328, and 1337.

2. Since, then, it is the peculiar duty of the Ordinary of the place to preach, and since it is incumbent on him to *choose* and to *depute* him who is to take his place and who is to supply for him in this most important ministry, even specifically in the case in which others by law or by custom furnish the expenses, no one either validly or lawfully may choose or invite a preacher even for his own church, and none of the clergy, secular or regular, may lawfully accept such invitation,⁴ unless within the limits and restrictions laid down in the articles that follow.

3. As parish priests, in virtue of the mandate which they get at their appointment, receive power to hear confessions, so also do they enjoy the faculty to preach, the law of residence and any other conditions, which the Ordinary shall have deemed necessary or useful to add, being fulfilled. The same is to be said of the Canon Theologian⁵ with regard to lectures on the Sacred Scriptures.

By parish priests, in this connexion, we are to understand not alone parish priests in the strict sense of the word, but also all those who have a dignity or an office to which the care of souls is attached. When a priest is assigned to such a position, by that very fact he is declared fit to hear the confessions of the souls committed to him and to preach the Word of God to them and has at least implicit approbation for the confessional and the pulpit. Hence our pastors and assistant priests, in virtue of their assignment, receive from the bishop

⁴ *Inventionem* in Latin text of the decree is clearly a misprint. The Italian text reads *invito*.

⁵ The Canon Theologian is one of the chief members of the Cathedral Chapter. His principal duty is, on the days appointed by the bishop, to read the Sacred Scriptures and explain them or to teach Scholastic Theology and sometimes even Moral Theology.

the faculty of preaching. However, our bishops may desire to enter more thoroughly into the spirit of the decree by inserting in the *pagella* of faculties which they give to their pastors and assistant priests, the faculty " *praedicandi verbum Dei* ".

4. In all other cases, to preach to the faithful in public churches or oratories, even those of regulars, and even by priests who are regulars, it is necessary that the faculty to do so be obtained from the Ordinary of the diocese.

According to the common law of the Church hitherto in force, those who were not *parochi* (in the sense explained above) required the leave of the bishop to preach. Regulars, in addition to the permission of their superiors, were required to present themselves before the diocesan bishop and request his blessing before preaching in churches of their order. If they intended to preach in churches other than those of their order, they required the permission of the bishop as well as that of their superior. Strictly speaking, in the first case it was necessary only to request the bishop's blessing, not actually to receive it. However, if the bishop positively refused it, the religious might not preach. There are reasons for thinking that this law may not always and everywhere be observed, and so the Sacred Consistorial Congregation has made a more stringent regulation. Henceforward those who are not " *parochi* " require in all cases the express *faculty* of preaching before presuming to preach to the faithful in a public church or oratory. This faculty is to be obtained from the Ordinary in whose diocese the church or oratory is situated and is similar to the faculty of hearing confessions, inasmuch as it is required for the validity and licitness of the assumption of the office of preacher.

5. In this section we are told who is to apply for this faculty.

This faculty, in accordance with the prescriptions of the new Code, canon 1341 §§ 1 and 2, is to be sought:

(a) by the first dignitary of the chapter, after the chapter, however, has been consulted, for preaching which, according to the law or wish of the chapter, takes place in its own church;

(b) by the superior of regulars, the rules of his own order or congregation having been observed, for churches of clerics who are regulars;

(c) by the parish priest, for the parochial church and other churches dependent upon it, i. e. mission churches, chapels of ease, etc.;

(d) and if there be question of the parish priest of a church belonging to the chapter or to a religious order, the faculty is to be sought by the same parish priest, for sermons for which he is responsible ("quae ab ipso pendent"), taking no account of the competency of the chapter or the order ("secluso capituli vel religionis interventu");

(e) by the director or chaplain of a confraternity, for its own church;

(f) by the priest who is pastor of a church and who there rightly carries out sacred functions, for all churches of other moral non-clerical corporations or of lay religious, nuns, or private persons.

The Italian version of the decree here adds: "Rimane escluso che tali petizioni vengano fatte o presentate da secolari, ed ogni consuetudine in contrario vesta condannata ed abolita." The choice of the Lenten and Advent preachers was sometimes granted to lay persons on the ground that they paid the honorarium to the preacher. The bishop, of course, had to approve of the preacher. Henceforward petitions presented by lay persons for faculties for a particular preacher should not be admitted and all customs to the contrary are hereby abolished.

6. In conformity with the decisions of the Sacred Congregation of the Council in Sutrina, 8 May, 1688, and in Ripana, 21 May, 1707, he who requests the aforesaid faculty should merely propose the name of the preacher, and that subject to the *beneplacitum* of the Ordinary, who alone may use the words "eligimus et deputamus ad postulationem N. N.," etc. The reason of this has been given already. The bishop is the official preacher of the diocese and he alone may appoint his substitute. In proposing the name of the preacher there should naturally be given sufficient data so that the bishop may be able to make the necessary inquiries concerning the preacher.

7. The request to obtain a preacher is to be made at a time useful and opportune for the Ordinary, so that he may be able conveniently to obtain the necessary information concerning the preacher (Code, canon 1341, § 2). This time, as a

rule, shall not be less than two months, as the Sacred Congregation of the Council has already laid down in *Theanen.*, 19 April, 1728, and 30 April, 1729; this, however, does not prevent the bishop from determining another time, even a shorter period, according to the kind and importance of the preaching and the quality of the preacher, whether he be a diocesan or extra-diocesan.

The bishop will naturally require more information and consequently more time in which to obtain it, if there be question of a series of sermons rather than a single sermon, if there be question of a preacher about whom the bishop knows nothing rather than one with whom he is acquainted, etc., etc.

8. Those who, taking no account of the obligation of seeking the faculty, invite a priest to preach, and also priests who, being invited in this fashion, knowingly accept and preach, are to be punished by the Ordinary. The penalties are left to his own will, and he may inflict even suspension *a divinis*.

It will sometimes happen that a priest guest who hails, for instance, from another diocese, will say one of the Sunday Masses in the parish church to which his host is attached. There will be no serious violation of the law, *salvo meliorum judicio*, if he makes the announcements, reads the Gospel, and gives a brief instruction. There is no formal invitation to preach and *epieikia* may be invoked in the circumstances.

9. When there is question of a preacher who does not belong to the diocese, the faculty of preaching must be in writing. Also the place and kind of preaching for which the faculty is given must be designated, for example, "eligimus et deputamus ad postulationem Reverendi Rectoris ecclesiae Sti. Joannis Evangelistae N. N. ad conciones quadragesimales in supradicta ecclesia praedicandas."

10. Ordinaries, *onerata graviter eorum conscientia*, should not grant the faculty of preaching to anyone until, first, they have an assurance of his piety, knowledge, and fitness, according to the prescriptions laid down in the following chapter. If, moreover, there be question of extra-diocesan priests or of religious of any order, Ordinaries are not to grant the faculty until they shall have first made inquiries of the Ordinary and superior respectively, and shall have obtained a favorable answer.

11. The Ordinary or religious superior who has been requested by another Ordinary for information as to the piety, knowledge, and fitness to preach of one of his subjects, is bound *sub gravi* to give this information in all truth, according to his knowledge and conscience, as is prescribed in Canon 1341, § 1, of the new Code. And the Ordinary who receives this information is bound to act on it and to observe absolute secrecy as to the information so received.

12. The Ordinary who, on account of information received as above, or for any other reason, shall determine in the Lord to deny the faculty of preaching to anyone, does his full duty by signifying simply to the petitioner that the faculty is refused, "quin aliud addat, soli Deo rationem de sua sententia redditurus."

CHAPTER II.

HOW THE FITNESS TO PREACH SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED.

13. In general, since before giving to any priest the faculty for the ministry of hearing the confessions of the faithful, Ordinaries are most strictly bound to be certain of the confessor's fitness, and should esteem themselves guilty if to so great a responsibility they should admit one who is unworthy because of his conduct or incapable for lack of the requisite knowledge, so, and not otherwise, should the same Ordinaries act before they choose and commission anyone for the ministry of the Word.

14. The regular means of knowing the fitness of anyone for the office of preaching, especially as regards knowledge and delivery, is an oral and written examination to be undergone by the candidate before three examiners, who at the will of the Ordinary may be selected from the synodal examiners or from priests not belonging to the diocese or even from the regular clergy.

After the fitness of the candidate as regards knowledge and delivery has been ascertained, or even before that, the Ordinary will inquire with no less diligence, and even with greater, whether the said candidate is worthy in piety, uprightness of conduct, and public esteem, to preach the Word of God.

15. According to the result of this double examination, the Ordinary may declare the candidate fit either for general

preaching or for a particular kind of preaching only, for a time or as an experiment and under certain conditions, or absolutely and for all time by giving him the *pagella praedicationis* in the selfsame way as it is given for confessions, or by simply refusing him the faculty to preach.

16. Ordinaries, however, are not prohibited, in particular cases and as an exception, from admitting one to preach without the above-mentioned examination, provided his fitness is evident by other clear proofs.

17. Nevertheless, it is absolutely forbidden to Ordinaries to give what are called diplomas in preaching to those who are not their subjects,⁶ or even to those who are their subjects if the diplomas be given merely as a title of honor and as a sign of esteem.

18. Although Ordinaries of regulars and exempt religious shall continue to enjoy for preaching within the enclosure of the religious house or monastery the faculty of deputing their own subjects, whom in accordance with the rules and constitutions of their own order they know to be fit (yet always in conformity with the prescriptions of the Code, canon 1338), nevertheless, if they wish to permit one of their subjects to preach in public churches, the churches of their own order included, they are bound to present him before the Ordinary of the place to undergo the examination according to the prescriptions laid down above in articles 13, 14, 15.

With regard to the examination specified in 14, our bishops as a rule will find it more convenient if clerics who are being educated for the diocese, undergo this examination immediately before ordination, as the examination for faculties for hearing confessions usually takes place at that time. In this case the bishop may depute three members of the seminary faculty to conduct the examination. In other cases, especially in large dioceses, the bishop may find it convenient to hold this examination at stated times for those who wish to enjoy the faculty of preaching in the diocese. On the recommendation of the examiners the Ordinary may restrict the faculty of preaching to a particular class of preaching, for example, catechetical instructions, or he may grant the faculty for a

⁶ The Latin text needs correction. For the first "subditis etiam propriis" (?), the Italian text has "a sudditi non propri".

time only, obliging the candidate to come up for examination later.

CHAPTER III.

WHAT IS TO BE OBSERVED OR AVOIDED IN SACRED PREACHING.⁷

19. Since holy things are to be treated in a holy manner, no one should undertake to preach unless he has worthily and proximately prepared himself by study as well as by prayer.

20. The matter of sermons must be essentially sacred (Code, canon 1347). But if the preacher would like to treat of other matters not strictly sacred, yet always in keeping with the house of God, he should seek and obtain faculty from the Ordinary of the place: and the Ordinary should never grant permission except after mature deliberation and after being convinced of its necessity. It is, however, entirely and absolutely forbidden to all preachers to treat of politics from the pulpit.

21. It shall be permitted to no one to preach funeral eulogies (*elogia funebria*) unless by previous and explicit permission of the Ordinary, who, before he gives consent, may insist that the manuscript of the discourse be shown to him.

22. The preacher should always have before his eyes and reduce to practice what St. Jerome commended to Nepotian: "*Divinas Scripturas saepius lege: imo numquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur . . . sermo presbyteri Scripturarum lectione conditus sit.*" To the study of Sacred Scripture should be joined the study of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church.

23. Quotations and testimonies of profane writers or authors should be employed with the greatest caution, and much more the sayings of heretics, apostates, and infidels: and the authority of persons who are living should never be brought forward. The Faith and uprightness of Christian morals do not need these guarantors and defenders.

24. The preacher should not look to the applause of his hearers; but he should seek merely the salvation of souls and the commendation of God and the Church. "*Docente te in ecclesia non clamor populi, sed gemitus suscitetur. Lacrymae auditorum laudes tuae sint*" (St. Jerome to Nepotian).

⁷ It will be of interest to compare this section with the Decrees of the Third Council of Baltimore, "*De Praedicationis Munere*", nn. 214 ff. There is a striking resemblance in more than one point.

25. The custom, in certain places, of employing newspapers or posters to attract hearers before the preaching, and to extol the merits of the preacher after the preaching, is to be absolutely reprobated and condemned, no matter under what pretext of good it may be done. Ordinaries should see that, in as far as they can, this practice does not arise.

26. With regard to delivery in preaching, nothing better can be prescribed than what St. Jerome wrote by way of warning to Nepotian: "*Nolo te declamatorem et rabulam garrulumque sine ratione, sed mysteriorum peritum et sacramentorum Dei eruditissimum. Verba volvere, et celeritate dicendi apud imperitum vulgus admirationem sui facere, indoctorum hominum est . . . Nihil tam facile quam vilem plebeculam et indoctam concionem lingue volubilitate decipere, quae quidquid non intelligit plus miratur.*"

27. Wherefore the preacher should accommodate himself to the ordinary intelligence of his hearers both in reasoning and in the use of language. As regards delivery and gesture he should observe that modesty and gravity which befit him who is the ambassador of Christ.

28. He should likewise always and most diligently be on his guard lest he may turn sacred preaching into a source of gain, by seeking the things that are his own and not those of Jesus Christ. Therefore he should not be desirous of filthy lucre nor allow himself to be ensnared by vainglory.

Nor should he ever allow to escape his mind the suggestion which, according to the doctrine of the Gospel and the Apostles and the examples of the saints, the same St. Jerome made to Nepotian: "*Non confundant opera tua sermonem tuum; ne cum in ecclesia loqueris, tacitus quilibet respondeat, 'Cur ergo haec quae dicis, ipse non facis?'*" *Delicatus magister est qui, pleno ventre, de jejuniis loquitur . . . Sacerdotis os, mens, manusque concordent.*"

CHAPTER IV.

TO WHOM AND IN WHAT MANNER PREACHING IS TO BE FORBIDDEN.

29. Preachers who neglect the prescriptions given in the preceding chapter, if they give hope of improvement and have not offended seriously, for the first or second time should be admonished and reprehended by the bishop.

30. But if they neglect to amend, or if they have gravely offended, to the scandal of the faithful, the bishop in accordance with the Code, canon 1340, §§ 2 and 3, should act as follows:

(a) if there be question of his own subject or of a religious to whom he himself gave the faculty of preaching, he should either revoke for a time or absolutely abrogate the faculty which he granted, *nullo hominum respectu*;

(b) but if there be question of a priest from another diocese or of a religious who has obtained the *pagella praedicandi* from some one else, he should forbid him to preach in his own diocese and at the same time he should bring the matter to the attention both of the offender's Ordinary and of him who gave the preacher the *pagella praedicationis*; moreover, in more serious cases he should refer the case to the Holy See;

(c) the bishop may also, and, indeed, according to circumstances he will sometimes be bound to, interrupt a preacher who offends gravely and prevent him from continuing to preach.

31. He likewise ought to be forbidden to preach, "saltem ad tempus et pro aliquo loco," who, because of his way of living or for any other reason, even through no fault of his own, has lost the good esteem of the public; so that his ministry has become useless or injurious.

32. Diocesan Ordinaries should institute, each in his own diocese, a commission of vigilance for preaching. This commission may be composed of the same priests as the commission for the examination of candidates.

33. But, since neither bishops nor the commission of vigilance can be everywhere in the diocese, when there is question of preaching of more than ordinary importance in the remote places, Ordinaries shall obtain from the vicars forane or the parish priests particular and precise information according to the regulations already laid down.

CHAPTER V.

REMOTE PREPARATION FOR THE MINISTRY OF PREACHING.

34. Ordinaries and religious superiors are strictly obliged to form to a holy and salutary style of preaching their own

clerics, at the time of studies, from their earliest years, both before and after their ordination to the priesthood.

35. They shall, therefore, see to it that the said clerics, during their theological course, be taught the various kinds of preaching; and they should have at hand and be acquainted with the famous models of every kind of sermon left us by the Fathers, to saying nothing of those which are to be found everywhere in the pages of the Holy Gospels, of the Acts and the Epistles of the Apostles.

36. Ordinaries shall also take pains that the youthful clerics be instructed with regard to the delivery and action to be observed in sermons, so that they may give proof of that gravity, simplicity, and clearness which in no way may savor of the stage, but be in keeping with the Word of God, and which demonstrate that the preacher speaks from conviction and from his heart, and that his attention is fixed on the sublime end for which his ministry was intended.

37. While this is being done in the seminaries or places of study the superiors will endeavor to ascertain for what kind of preaching each of the students has most aptitude, so that they may make a report of it to the Ordinary.

38. Ordinaries shall take care that the initial instruction given to clerics in the seminaries or houses of study be perfected, even after they have received Holy Orders.

39. Wherefore, in accordance with the information had of each, they will engage and exercise them first in the easier and more humble kinds of preaching, such as, teaching catechism to children, briefly explaining the Gospel, and such like.

40. Finally, Ordinaries may prescribe for their clerics that for some years after ordination they undergo each year *in curia* an oral and written examination in preaching. This examination may be conducted in the manner that appears best to them and in conformity with the prescriptions of the Code with regard to the annual examinations to be undergone by clerics after their ordination to the priesthood.

The foregoing regulations were issued from the Sacred Congregation of the Consistory, 28 June, 1917.

JOSEPH MACCARTHY.

St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y.

THE PRIEST AS PREACHER AND CATECHIST.

THAT the pastor of souls is divinely authorized to preach and catechize is beyond doubt. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, "began to do and to teach". And before His Ascension into heaven, He bade His priests to "go and teach all nations". Here we have the office of teaching the truths of Divine Revelation pointed out and enjoined by the example and precept of the great High Priest Himself. That this divinely imposed duty is important and fundamental follows from the very nature of the priestly office. In a certain sense it is more important than the administration of the Sacraments. The reception of six out of the seven Sacraments requires preliminary instruction, and Baptism, the seventh, is conferred only when the minister may presume that the recipient will in due time be instructed in the true faith. To hear confessions and administer Holy Communion are important sacerdotal duties, but it is the sermon or instruction that must precede, and induce people to go to confession and Holy Communion.

The true priest, however, will look upon the office of teaching the Word of God rather as a privilege than a duty. For it is by teaching the truths of Divine Revelation that he is able to appease the spiritual hunger and thirst of his fellow-men, a hunger and thirst that cannot be satisfied in any other way. "I am the Bread of Life," says our Lord; "he that cometh to me shall not hunger." And again, "He that shall drink of the water which I shall give him, shall not thirst forever." It is the priest's blessed privilege to sow the seed of the Word of God for the harvest to be garnered by the angels of heaven on the last day.

But how is he to do this? The human mind, we are told, is created a "tabula rasa". Knowledge, religious as well as secular, must therefore come from without. Both kinds of knowledge are to be provided, either at home or elsewhere, by the child's natural parents. The training begun at home is to be continued at school. A thorough course of catechetical instruction at school is to supplement and round out the religious training of the home. And this religious knowledge and training given at school ought to be under the direction of the

child's spiritual parent, the pastor. He has the duty of providing the children confided to him with the nourishment which is needed to preserve and develop their spiritual life: "Not in bread alone doth man live, but in every word that proceedeth from the mouth of God." And this spiritual nourishment is to be provided the younglings of the flock daily; it is "the declaration of God's word . . . that will give understanding to little ones." Every zealous pastor, then, will be watchful to have religious instruction given all the children confided to him regularly and thoroughly throughout the entire parish school course. At the beginning of each scholastic year he will see to it that the various grades be started in the Catechism where they left off the previous year.

Whatever be one's method or system of giving catechetical instruction, preparation ought to precede every lesson. If the children are to do most of the talking, as practically all catechists advise, the questions must be such as will stimulate interest and excite emulation. So, too, for the stories that are told and the illustrations used. The children of the lower grades, especially those who are preparing for their first confession and Holy Communion, require more attention than their seniors. Then, too, special attention ought to be given those who no longer attend the parish school. I deem it advisable to insist that all the boys and girls of the parish school attend Sunday school till their eighteenth year. Those who complete the course might then be presented with a beautiful diploma on the occasion of the commencement exercises in June. Pope Benedict XIV does not hesitate to assert that the teaching of the Catechism to children is "the most useful of instructions for the glory of God and the salvation of souls."¹ Consequently we can scarcely overrate the importance and necessity of teaching the Catechism to the children entrusted to us.

In order, moreover, that the Catholic as well as the non-Catholic *adult* attain his eternal destiny, instruction is again of supreme importance; for, "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of Christ". The divinely authorized person to give this instruction and preach the Gospel is the priest. A vocation from God is, therefore, the first requisite

¹ Const. *Etsi minimum*, p. 13.

to preach the truths of Revelation. What a sorry figure is the stage priest! Such, in the economy of grace, would be the man who attempted to deliver the Gospel message without being called to do so. Supposing the presence of a divine vocation to preach the Gospel, the duty to do so becomes binding in conscience. The catechetical instruction given in school and at Sunday school must be supplemented and amplified by the sermon given to the whole congregation by the pastor who has received the command from Christ, through the Church, "to preach the Gospel".

The office of preacher calls for all the zeal, talent, knowledge, and experience that a priest has at his command. And if he discharge this office conscientiously, it will prove the most fruitful as well as the most consoling of his sacerdotal duties.

The subject matter of the sermon is the same as that of the catechetical instruction, viz. the truths that all must believe, the commandments of God and the Church, and the means of grace. The manner of treating it, however, may differ. Every sermon ought to impress at least *one* practical and important revealed truth upon the minds and hearts of the hearers. Jesus Christ, whose ambassador the priest is, came into the world to be its light. It is by means of the Gospel truths that He becomes "the light which enlighteneth every man that cometh into the world." His priests are called to absorb as much as possible of this supernal light, and then through the office of preacher to reflect it upon their fellow-men.

In the choice of the particular truth or topic to be treated, the pulpit orator has an advantage over all other public speakers. He can choose his subject; the public speaker cannot. This circumstance places a countless variety, also, of examples and illustrations at the disposal of the preacher of God's Word. The earth and all that it contains is the Lord's; hence, the earth and all that it contains can serve to glorify the Lord, and to illustrate His revelation to mankind. Occasional sermons, in a measure, form an exception. Of these the funeral sermon, above all, requires great tact, prudence, and common sense. Concerning funeral sermons, I take the liberty of quoting from an editorial which appeared in a local newspaper a few years ago: "It is safe to say that more Simon pure lying

is perpetrated in funeral orations, often by ministers, than at any other ceremonies in which people participate. Political orators lie brazenly enough, but there is usually some chance for argument over their statements. The funeral orator, however, gets up and lies when he knows he's lying and that all his hearers know he's lying. . . . 'Speak only good of the dead' is well enough, but it ought to be amended by adding, 'But, rather than lie about the dead, keep your mouth shut.' . . . It is a fact that the truth about the dead cannot affect the dead, while lies about them can hurt the living. What must our youth think, who, knowing that the deceased has been a brute or rascal all his life, hear him praised and flattered by clerical or other orators at a funeral, to say nothing of the gush poured out on him by the newspapers? They must think that brutishness or rascality pays in the long run, mustn't they? And what respect can a minister of the gospel hold who deliberately lies simply because the deceased is dead? There is sin rather than sense in saying that about the dead, or the living, which is known to be false. To do it in pretense of sympathy for those who are grieving over the corpse is false and known as such to those who grieve. . . . The truth is mighty and will prevail as to the dead as well as to the living. It is the false, however disguised, however apologized for, that is hurtful." ²

A sermon, whether to a large or to a small audience, whether in a church or in a chapel, whether to the erudite or the unlettered, should aim at making Jesus Christ and His Gospel better known and loved. As human history either leads up to or proceeds from the Redeemer of mankind, so should every sermon. The Apostles could not go astray, because they were so near the Cross. And the chief reason why Protestantism is becoming more and more divided and disrupted is because its ministers do not preach Jesus Christ and Him crucified. The periodicals of the day furnish them the subject matter for their sermons, and consequently their preaching is in vain.

A reformation of public morals is to be looked for rather in a well-trained public conscience than from federal laws, official censors, civil statutes or ordinances. And the Catholic

² *The Toledo News-Bee*, 14 August, 1909.

priest is divinely called to coöperate in this great work of training the public conscience. Willy, nilly, he is a teacher of morality, and as such is constantly exerting a great influence for good or evil on the moral life of his fellow-citizens. For this reason he is obliged to preach Jesus Christ, who is the Way, as well as the Life of the world. The remote, if not the proximate end of every sermon must, then, be to lead men to Jesus Christ, the Way, the Truth and the Life.

And to do this in an effectual manner requires preparation. Hence, preparation of a serious kind is obligatory. If the pastor of souls is bound *sub gravi* to instruct his people, he certainly is obliged also to prepare that which he provides them in his sermons and instructions.

The vastness of the subject makes it impossible to enter upon the various methods of preparing a sermon. Those interested will find a good article on this topic in these pages for January, 1916. "The worst method of all," as the writer well concludes, "is to choose a subject, and then trust to unblushing effrontery and fluency for the rest." On the other hand, however, no two men are the same. Everyone has his own peculiar character and temperament. If, as is said, no two men think alike, then no two men can treat the same subject in the same way and be natural. Hence, the same method of preparing a sermon cannot be prescribed for all. Nor will one and the same method be suited to any one individual throughout his entire life. But, no matter what method be employed, the time and labor involved in preparing a sermon ought to be about the same. The whole matter, it seems to me, had better be left to self-analysis and experience, under the guidance of priestly zeal. Father Potter, in his excellent book on *Sacred Eloquence*, urges beginners to write out their sermons in full; he says: "Even supposing the young preacher to possess *in radice* the faculty of speaking well, let him be convinced that he must be content to develop it in the commencement by writing. No matter how brilliant his talent, or keen his intellect, he will not be able to cultivate the one or the other in the most profitable manner except by a good deal of laborious committing of his conceptions to paper, and a still more laborious working of them out".³

³ *Sacred Eloquence*, p. 109.

It goes without saying that he who enters the pulpit without that preparation which he should and could have given, is guilty of presumption. Nor can he have that intelligent and unswerving faith and conviction which is the fruit of serious and prayerful preparation. His sermon will be either too short or too long; in all probability, entirely too long. It can produce no lasting fruit, and is bound to fall flat. Moreover, what is said in a careless and superficial manner, will be accepted in the same way; consequently, such a sermon will often destroy the little faith left in the cold and indifferent among their audience. None can expect to preach the Word of God in an effectual and becoming manner who does not make it the subject of study and daily meditation. It is especially by *meditative* prayer that the virtue of supernatural faith is to be nourished and increased: "Lord, I believe; help my unbelief." The stronger one's faith, the deeper will be his conviction and power of persuasion.

The Catholic priest is not in the predicament of the Protestant minister, who comes along with his so-called Bible in hand, and interprets its spurious contents according to his own erring judgment. The Revealed Word is given us by its divinely appointed custodian and interpreter with the injunction to teach its vivifying and consoling message with unswerving conviction. And have we not the assurance of our Lord's abiding presence and assistance? "And lo, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world". Of all preachers of the Gospel, the priest alone can say, "The doctrine which I preach is not mine but His who sent me."

Preparation, too, makes for greater clearness of diction. In order to secure a clear insight into any subject, it is necessary to view it from various angles. Study, research, and meditation must precede if the sermon is to be clear and the language used adapted to the capacity of the hearers. What one clearly conceives, he is ordinarily able to express clearly.

A sermon should, likewise, be definite and practical. He who aims at nothing will generally hit the mark he aimed at. The stories, anecdotes, examples, and illustrations used, must be intimately related to the theme, else they will fail to illustrate. Every figure of speech must be suited to the capacity and daily lives of the hearers, else they will not appeal to

them. I dare say the most common of all faults is that of addressing the intellect too much. The vast majority of those whom we are to instruct never reason a thing out. Hence, it is of far greater importance to persuade their wills. The audience must be able to *feel* what we have to tell them. Motives of reward and punishment are to be presented in a way that will enforce, if possible, the practice of the Commandments. This supposes, however, that the preacher be strongly impressed with his theme. One can as little move without being moved, as convince without being convinced. In vain can the objection be raised that wicked men often succeed in influencing others to amend their lives. I dare say that such men at the time they wrote or spoke actually did possess an exalted idea of virtue; but, they lost it unfortunately later on. The influence for good cannot, in such cases, be of long duration. Reason and time are sure to detect the malice and hypocrisy if the preacher does not practise what he preaches.

Although it ill becomes an ambassador of Christ ever to "put his ear to the ground", yet, he must endeavor to make the Gospel attractive: "To them that love the law there is no stumbling-block." "The letter of the law killeth, but (its) spirit quickeneth."

A word now in regard to the actual delivery of a sermon. The priest as preacher goes before his congregation, not in his own name, but in the name of Jesus Christ, the Lord of Lords. The faithful are bound to give him a hearing, for of him it has been said: "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." Without Christ's encouraging words and example, however, we would be at a loss how to acquit ourselves of the sublime office of preaching. Our aim must be to teach and preach after the manner of Him whose ambassadors we are. The Son of God, we read, spoke with authority and as one having power. Here we have the first requisites of the preacher. And surely none on earth can speak with greater authority than he who is commissioned to deliver a message from God Himself. United with the supreme head of the Church, the priest is called to reëcho the voice of Him who first preached the blessed tidings of the Gospel nineteen hundred years ago. Every priest in Christendom can go before his people and preach the truths of Reve-

lation with authority, yea, the highest authority; for to him has been said, "As the Father hath sent me, so I send you," etc. Moreover, Christ did not speak in an off-hand, doubtful, or ambiguous manner. His were convictions, not opinions. And His injunction to His Apostles and their successors is: "Let your speech be yes, yes; no, no!". The doctrinal truths which we have the duty to communicate, have their origin in the infinite mind of God. Consequently, they are not open to discussion. Catholic dogma must be accepted on faith, because it is the infallible truth, defined by an infallible teaching authority. This should appear in the manner in which it is presented.

Moreover, since the priest is an ambassador of Christ and the oracle of God's Revelation to mankind, his speech and delivery should be marked by dignity. His rank among men being the highest, he is never permitted to harangue, or to do aught else which might reflect discredit on his exalted office. It is well, moreover, to develop as much enthusiasm as possible. If a man meditates deeply on the truths of Divine Revelation, he cannot help becoming sensibly moved by their power and attractiveness. He will then gradually come to view things spiritual with a different eye from the rest of men; knowledge of this kind begets enthusiasm and makes men eloquent. The sentiment and passion to be communicated by the pulpit orator is an intimate persuasion and deep conviction of the truths treated in the sermon; and eloquence is defined as the transferring of the enthusiasm we ourselves feel into the breast of another. What is felt with emotion is commonly expressed with emotion.

The preacher should impress his audience with the idea that "he has something of great importance to tell them and knows how to say it". He has a decided advantage over all other public speakers in the grandeur and sublimity of his subject matter. Sublimity does not consist in the language one uses, but rather in the truths we are to teach to others. A human thought is already something wonderful; now, the burden of our sermons is made up of "the burning thoughts, sublime conceptions, and grand ideas born of God". Could anything more sublime be imagined!

The reward of diligent endeavor in preaching and catechizing is immediate and inspiring. Or what could be more gratifying than to see the light of faith, like the golden rays of the rising sun, gradually illumine the countenances of one's hearers, and the flame of divine love enkindle their hearts? If what is said is presented in the proper manner, both the victory and the triumph are bound to follow.

To sum up briefly. In order to acquit oneself of the office of preacher and catechist intelligently and meritoriously, it is necessary to preserve a prayerful disposition, draw on the Scriptures for one's subject matter, study the text to be treated thoroughly, express oneself in suitable language, and deliver the sermon or instruction in an appropriate manner, with clearness, conviction, dignity, and authority, always and solely seeking God's glory and the salvation of souls. This is the sublime vocation and blessed privilege of the Priest of God as preacher and catechist.

FREDERICK A. HOUCK.

Toledo, Ohio.



Analecta.

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV.

LITTERAE ENCYCLICAE

DE PRAEDICATIONE DIVINI VERBI.

AD PATRIARCHAS, PRIMATES, ARCHIEPISCOPOS, EPISCOPOS
ALIOSQUE LOCORUM ORDINARIOS, PACEM ET COMMUNIONEM
CUM APOSTOLICA SEDE HABENTES.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV

VENERABILES FRATRES SALUTEM ET APOSTOLICAM
BENEDICTIONEM.

Humani generis Redemptionem Iesus Christus in ara Crucis moriendo cum consummasset, velletque adducere homines ut, suis praeceptis obtemperando, compotes fierent aeternae vitae, non alia usus est via quam suorum voce praeconum qui, quae ad salutem credenda faciendaeque essent, hominum universitati denuntiarent. *Placuit Deo per stultitiam praedicationis salvos facere credentes.*¹ Elegit igitur Apostolos, quibus cum per Spiritum Sanctum dona infudisset tanto muneri consentanea, *Euntes, inquit, in mundum universum praedicate Evangelium.*² Quae quidem praedicatio faciem orbis terrae renovavit. Nam, si Fides christiana mentes hominum a mul-

¹ 1 Cor., I, 21.

² Marc., 16, 15.

tiplici errore ad veritatem, animosque a sordibus vitiorum ad omnium virtutum excellentiam convertit, profecto ipsius praedicationis ope convertit: *Fides ex auditu, auditus autem per verbum Christi*.³ Quapropter, quoniam, Dei nutu, iisdem causis quibus procreatae sunt, res conservantur, patet praedicationem christianae sapientiae ad continuandum aeternae salutis opus divinitus adhiberi; et eam in maximis gravissimisque rebus iure numerari: in quam propterea curae cogitationesque a Nobis praecipuae conferendae sunt, maxime si aliqua ex parte, a nativa integritate, cum suae efficacitatis detrimento, deficere videatur.

Id enimvero est, venerabiles Fratres, quod ad ceteras miseras horum temporum quibus Nos ante alios sollicitamur, accedit. Etenim, si circumspeciamus quam multi sint qui verbo Dei praedicando dant operam, tanta occurret copia, quanta fortasse numquam fuit antea. Si autem consideremus, quo loco sint publice ac privatim mores atque instituta populorum, crescit in dies vulgo rerum quae supra naturam sunt, despicientia et oblivio; sensim a christianae virtutis severitate disceditur, maioresque ad probrosam ethnicorum vitam quotidie regressus fiunt.

Horum quidem malorum variae sunt multiplicesque causae: nemo tamen negaverit deplorandum esse quod eis malis a ministris verbi non satis afferatur medicinae. Numquid sermo Dei talis esse desiit, qualis ab Apostolo dicebatur, vivus et efficax et penetrabilior omni gladio ancipiti? Num gladii huius aciem usus diuturnitas hebetavit? Vitio certe tribuendum est ministrorum qui non tractant, quemadmodum oportet, hunc gladium, si is non omnibus locis vim suam exerceat. Neque enim dici potest melioribus, quam nos, temporibus Apostolos usos esse, quasi tum aut plus esset docilitatis ad Evangelium aut minus contra divinam legem contumaciae.

Omnino igitur, quod Nos apostolici officii conscientia admonet duorumque proximorum Decessorum exemplum hortatur, huc summo studio, pro rei gravitate, incumbendum Nobis esse intelligimus, ut praedicationem divini verbi ad eam normam, ad quam Christi Domini iussu Ecclesiaeque statutis dirigenda est, ubique revocemus.

³ *Rom.*, 10, 17.

Principio, venerabiles Fratres, quaeramus oportet, quas ob causas in hoc genere de via declinetur. Iam istae causae ad tres redire videntur: aut is ad praedicandum assumitur qui non debet; aut id muneris non eo exercetur consilio quo debet; aut non eo modo quo oportet.

Etenim praedicationis munus, ex Tridentinae Synodi doctrina, *Episcoporum praecipuum est.*⁴ Apostoli quidem, quorum in locum successere Episcopi, hoc maxime suarum partium esse duxerunt. Ita Paulus: *Non enim misit me Christus baptizare, sed evangelizare.*⁵ Ceterorum autem Apostolorum ea fuit sententia: *Non est aequum nos derelinquere verbum Dei, et ministrare mensis.*⁶ Etsi autem proprium id est Episcoporum, tamen, quoniam variis distenti curis in suarum gubernatione ecclesiarum, nec semper nec usque quaque ipsi per se possunt, necesse est etiam per alios huic officio satisfaciant. Quare in hoc munere quicumque praeter Episcopos versantur, dubitandum non est quin, episcopali fungentes officio, versentur.—Haec igitur prima lex sanciat, ut munus praedicationis sua sponte suscipere liceat nemini; sed ad illud exsequendum cuivis opus sit missione legitima, quae, nisi ab Episcopo, dari non potest: *Quomodo praedicabunt, nisi mittantur?*⁷ Missi sunt enim Apostoli et ab Eo missi qui summus est Pastor et Episcopus animarum nostrarum;⁸ missi septuaginta duo illi discipuli; ipseque Paulus, quamvis constitutus iam a Christo vas electionis ut nomen eius coram gentibus et regibus portaret,⁹ tum demum iniit apostolatum quum seniores, Spiritus Sancti mandato *Segregate mihi Saulum in opus* (Evangelii),¹⁰ obtemperantes, eum cum impositione manuum dimisissent. Id quod primis Ecclesiae temporibus perpetuo usitatum est. Omnes enim, vel qui in sacerdotum ordine eminebant, ut Origenes, et qui postea ad episcopatum evecti sunt, ut Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, ut Ioannes Chrysostomus, ut Augustinus ceterique Doctores Ecclesiae veteres, sese ex sui quisque Episcopi auctoritate ad praedicandum contulerunt.

⁴ Sess. XXIV, *De Ref.*, c. IV.

⁵ I *Cor.*, I, 17.

⁶ *Act.*, 6, 2.

⁷ *Rom.*, 10, 15.

⁸ I *Petr.*, 2, 25.

⁹ *Act.*, 9, 15.

¹⁰ *Act.*, 13, 2.

Nunc vero, venerabiles Fratres, longe aliud venisse in consuetudinem videtur. E sacris oratoribus non ita pauci sunt in quos apte cadere illud dixeris quod queritur Dominus apud Ieremiam: *Non mittebam prophetas, et ipsi currebant.*¹¹ Nam cuicumque vel ex ingenii indole vel aliis quibusvis de causis *ministerium verbi* suscipere libuerit, facile ei patet aditus ad suggesta templorum, tamquam ad palaestram in qua quivis suo arbitratu sese exerceat. Itaque ut iam de medio tollatur tanta perversitas, vestrum est, venerabiles Fratres, providere; et quoniam de pabulo vestris gregibus praebito reddenda Deo Ecclesiaeque a vobis ratio est, ne sinite ut quis, iniussu vestro, in ovile se inferat, et oves Christi ad suum arbitrium pascat. Nemo igitur in dioecesibus vestris, nisi vocatus probatusque a vobis, iam nunc sacras conciones habeat.

Hic vero summa cum vigilantia attendatis volumus quibus munus tam sanctum demandetis. Qua in re Episcopis hoc tantum, Concilii Tridentini decreto, permittitur ut *idoneos* eligant, id est qui possint *officium praedicationis salubriter exsequi*. *Salubriter*, dictum est—notate verbum quo rei continetur norma non *eloquenter*, non *cum plausu audientium*, verum cum animarum fructu, ad quem, tamquam finem, divini verbi administratio pertinet.—Quod si pressius definiri a Nobis cupitis quos reapse habeatis idoneos, eos dicimus in quibus divinae vocationis argumenta reperietis. Nam quod requiritur ut quis ad sacerdotium admittatur: *Nec quisquam sumit sibi honorem, sed qui vocatur a Deo,*¹² idem opus est ut quis ad praedicandum habilis aptusque iudicetur. Quae quidem vocatio haud difficile deprehenditur. Christus enim, Dominus et Magister Noster, cum in eo esset ut in caelum adscenderet, nequaquam dixit Apostolis ut illico, diversi abeuntes, praedicare inciperent: *Sedete, inquit, in civitate, quoadusque induamini virtute ex alto.*¹³ Hoc igitur erit indicio quempiam divinitus ad id muneris vocari, si is virtute ex alto sit indutus. Quod cuiusmodi sit, licet ex iis colligere, venerabiles Fratres, quae in Apostolis, statim ut virtutem desuper acceperint, scimus evenisse. Ubi enim in eos Spiritus Sanctus descendit—ne

¹¹ Ierem., 23, 21.

¹² Hebr., 5, 4.

¹³ Luc., 24, 49.

mirifica, quibus aucti sunt, charismata attingamus—ex rudibus infirmisque hominibus docti perfectique evaserunt. Sit igitur sacerdos quispiam congruenti tum scientia tum virtute praeditus—modo ei dona naturae suppetant quae necessaria sunt ne tentetur Deus—recte ad praedicationem vocatus videbitur, neque erit cur ab Episcopo ad hoc munus non possit assumi. Quod ipsum vult Tridentina Synodus, cum edicit, ne quos Episcopus praedicare sinat qui non *sint moribus et doctrina probati*.¹⁴ Itaque Episcopi est eos, quibus praedicandi munus deferre cogitat, diu multumque experiri ut quae quantaque sit eorum et doctrinae copia et vitae sanctimonia cognoscat. Qui si remisse negligenterque se gesserit, is profecto in re gravissima deliquerit, et in eius caput culpa recidet vel errorum quos imperitus praedicator fuderit, vel offensionis malique exempli quod improbus deditit.

Quo autem faciliores in hoc vestras, venerabiles Fratres, reddamus partes, volumus ut qui praedicandi potestatem petunt, non secus ac qui confessiones peccatorum excipiendi, de eorum moribus et eruditione posthac duplex severumque fiat iudicium. Quisquis igitur in alterutro mancus et claudicans repertus sit, nullo rei cuiusquam respectu, repellatur ab eiusmodi munere cui non esse eum idoneum constiterit. Postulat id vestra ipsorum dignitas, quorum vices a praedicatoribus geruntur, ut diximus; flagitat Ecclesiae sanctae utilitas, quandoquidem *sal terrae et lux mundi* esse,¹⁵ si quis alius, is debet qui in verbi ministerio versatur.

His probe consideratis rebus, ultra progredi ad explicandum quem sacrae praedicationis et finem et modum esse oporteat, supervacaneum potest videri. Nam si ad eam, quam memoravimus, regulam sacrorum oratorum delectus exigatur, quid est dubii quin, congruis ornati virtutibus, dignam in praedicando et causam sibi proponant et rationem teneant? Sed tamen prodest haec duo illustrare capita, ut eo melius appareat, quare interdum boni praedicatoris forma in nonnullis desideretur.

Quid praedicatoribus debeat in suscepto munere exsequendo esse propositum, licet intelligere ex eo quod ii possunt ac de-

¹⁴ Loc. cit.

¹⁵ Math., 5, 13, 14.

bent de se idem, quod Paulus, affirmare: *Pro Christo legatione fungimur.*¹⁶ Si autem legati sunt Christi, illud ipsum velle debent in legatione peragenda quod Christus voluit in danda; immo quod ipse, dum vixit in terris, sibi proposuit. Neque enim Apostoli, et praedicatores post Apostolos, alio missi sunt atque Christus: *Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos.*¹⁷ Scimus autem cuius rei gratia Christus de caelo descenderit: aperte enim declaravit: *Ego ad hoc veni in mundum, ut testimonium perhibeam veritati,*¹⁸ *Ego veni, ut vitam habeant.*¹⁹

Utumque igitur persequantur oportet qui sacrae praedicationi dant operam, id est, ut traditae a Deo veritatis diffundant lumen et ut in iis qui audiunt, supernaturalem excitent alantque vitam; brevi, ut animarum quaerendo salutem, Dei promoveant gloriam. Quare, sicut perperam appelletur medicus, qui medicinam non faciat, vel alicuius artis doctor qui eam non doceat artem, sic qui praedicando non curat ad pleniorum Dei cognitionem et ad aeternae salutis viam homines adducere, eum declamatorem vaniloquum appellari licet, praedicatorem evangelicum non licet. Atque utinam huiusmodi declamatores nulli sint!—Quid vero est quo ducuntur maxime? Alii quidem inanis gloriae cupiditate: cui scilicet ut satisfaciant: “Student magis alta quam apta dicere, facientes apud infirmas intelligentias miraculum sui, non ipsorum salutem operantes. Erubescunt humilia et plana dicere, ne sola haec scisse videantur. . . . Erubescunt lactare parvulos.”²⁰ Cumque Iesus Dominus ex humilitate auditorum ostenderet se eum esse qui exspectabatur: *Pauperes evangelizantur,*²¹ quid non moliuntur isti, ut ex urbium celebritate atque ex primariorum dignitate templorum commendationem suis sermonibus acquirant? Quoniam autem in rebus a Deo revelatis quaedam sunt quibus corruptae humanae naturae perterreatur infirmitas, quaeque ob eam causam accommodatae non sunt ad evocandam multitudinem, ab iis caute se abstinere eaque tractant in quibus, si loci rationem excipias, nihil est sacrum. Ac non raro contingit ut in media

¹⁶ 2 Cor., 5, 20.

¹⁷ Ioan., 20, 21.

¹⁸ Ibid., 18, 37.

¹⁹ Ibid., 10, 10.

²⁰ Gillebertus Ab., *In Cant. Canticor. serm. XXVII, 2.*

²¹ Matth., 11, 5.

pertractatione rerum aeternarum labantur ad politica, praesertim si quid eius generis animos audientium vehementer teneat occupatos. Omnino unum hoc iis esse studium videtur, placere audientibus eisque morem gerere quos Paulus *prurientes auribus*²² dicit. Hinc ille gestus non sedatus et gravis, sed qualis in scaena aut in concione populari solet agi; hinc illae vocis vel remissiones molliores, vel contentiones tragicae; hinc illud orationis genus proprium ephemeridum; hinc sententiarum illa copia ab impiorum et acatholicorum petita scriptis, non a divinis Litteris, non a Sanctis Patribus; hinc denique illa et, quae ab eorum plerisque usurpatur volubilitas tanta verborum, qua obtundant quidem aures et admirationem moveant audientibus, sed nihil his boni afferant quod domum reportent. Iam vero mirum quantum praedicatores isti opinione falluntur. Habeant licet quem tanto cum labore nec sine sacrilegio petunt plausum imperitorum: num pretium est operae, quando simul subeunda eis est prudentium omnium vituperatio et, quod est maius, formidandum Christi severissimum iudicium?

Quamquam, venerabiles Fratres, unice plausus quaerere praedicando non omnium est qui a regula normaue aberrant. Plerumque huiusmodi significationes qui captant, ideo captant ut eas ad aliud assequendum dirigant vel minus honestum. Nam, oblivioni dantes illud Gregorii: "Non praedicat sacerdos ut comedat, sed ideo ut praedicet, manducare debet"²³ haud ita rari sunt qui, cum ad alia munera, quibus decenter alerentur, non se factos esse intelligerent, ad praedicationem se contulerunt, non ministerii sanctissimi rite exercendi, verum quaestus faciendi causa. Videmus igitur curas omnes istorum minime conversas esse ad quaerendum ubi maior sperari possit fructus animarum, sed ubi plus conficiatur praedicando lucri.

Iam vero, cum ab his nihil exspectare liceat Ecclesiae, nisi damnum et dedecus, summopere vobis, venerabiles Fratres, est vigilandum, ut, si quem inveneritis praedicatione ad suam gloriam vel ad quaestum abuti, eum sine cunctatione amoveatis ab officio praedicandi. Nam qui rem tam sanctam polluere non veretur tanta perversitate propositi, non sane dubitabit ad omnes indignitates descendere, ignominiae labem aspergens

²² 2 *Tim.*, 4, 3.

²³ *In I Regum*, lib. III.

non sibi tantum, sed ipsi etiam sacro muneri, quod tam prave administrat.

Eadem autem erit adhibenda severitas in eos qui quo decet modo non praedicent, propterea quod ea neglexerint, quae ad recte hoc ministerium obeundum necessario requiruntur. Haec vero quae sint, docet exemplo suo is qui ab Ecclesia cognominatus est *Praedicator veritatis*, Paulus Apostolus: cuius similes praedicatores utinam, Dei miserentis beneficio, multo plures habeamus.

Primum igitur quod discimus a Paulo hoc est, quam bene paratus et instructus ad praedicandum venerit. Neque vero hic loquimur de doctrinae studiis in quibus, Gamaliele magistro, diligenter versatus erat. Scientia enim in eo *per revelationem* infusa, obscurabat ac paene obruebat eam quam ipse sibi comparaverat: quamquam hanc quoque non parum ei profuisse ex eius Epistolis apparet. Prorsus necessaria est praedicatori scientia, ut diximus, cuius quidem luce qui caret, facile labitur, ex Concilii Lateranensis IV verissima sententia: "Ignorantia est mater cunctorum errorum." Non tamen de qualibet rerum scientia volumus intelligi, sed de ea scilicet quae propria est sacerdotis, quaeque, ut in pauca conferamus rem, cognitione sui, Dei, et officiorum continetur: sui, inquam, ut suas quisque utilitates omittat; Dei, ut omnes ad eum et cognoscendum et diligendum adducat; officiorum, ut ea servet et servari praecipiat. Ceterarum rerum scientia, ista si desit, *inflat* nec quicquam prodest.

Illud potius videamus, qualis in Apostolo praeparatio fuerit animi. Qua quidem in re tria sunt maxime consideranda. Primum ut se totum Paulus divinae voluntati dediderit. Vixdum enim, cum iter faceret Damascum, Iesu Domini virtute tactus est, edidit illam Apostolo dignam vocem: *Domine, quid me vis facere?*²⁴ Nam promiscua illi statim coeperunt esse pro Christo, sicut perpetuo fuerunt postea, laborare et quiescere, egere et abundare, laudari et contemni, vivere et mori. Non est dubium quin ideo in apostolatu tantum profecerit, quod se Dei voluntati pleno cum obsequio permisit. Quare similiter ante omnia obsequatur Deo quisquis praedicator ad salutem animarum nititur; ut nihil quidquam sit sollicitus quos auditores,

²⁴ *Act.*, 9, 6.

quem successum, quos fructus habiturus sit: denique ut Deum dumtaxat, non se respiciat.

Hoc autem tantum Deo obsequendi studium animum postulat adeo comparatum ad patiendum, ut nullum fugiat laboris molestiaeque genus. Quod alterum in Paulo fuit insigne. Nam, cum de eo dixisset Dominus: *Ego ostendam illi, quanta oporteat eum pro nomine meo pati*,²⁵ ipse deinde aerumnas omnes tanta cum voluntate complexus est ut scriberet: *Superabundo gaudio in omni tribulatione nostra*.²⁶ Iam vero haec laboris tolerantia in praedicatori si emineat, cum quicquid humani in eo sit, abstergeat, ac Dei gratiam ei ad fructum ferendum conciliet, tum incredibile est quam eius operam christiano populo commendet. Contra, parum ad permovendos animos ii possunt, qui quocumque venerint, ibi commoditates vitae plus aequo consecantur, ac dum suas conciones habeant, nihil aliud fere attingunt ministerii sacri, ut appareat plus eos propriae servire valetudini, quam animarum utilitati.

Tertio denique loco *spiritum orationis* qui dicitur, necessarium praedicatori esse intelligimus ex Apostolo; qui ut primum vocatus est ad apostolatam, Deo supplex esse instituit: *Ecce enim orat*.²⁷ Etenim non copiose dicendo nec subtiliter disserendo aut vehementer perorando salus quaeritur animarum: qui hic consistat praedicator nihil est nisi *aes sonans aut cymbalum tinniens*.²⁸ Id quo fit ut vigeant humana verba mirificeque valeant ad salutem, divina est gratia: *Deus incrementum dedit*.²⁹ Dei autem gratia non studio et arte comparatur, sed precibus impetratur. Quare qui parum aut nihil orationi est deditus, frustra in praedicatione operam curamque consumit, cum coram Deo nec sibi nec audientibus quicquam proficiat.

Itaque, paucis concludentes quae hactenus diximus, his Petri Damiani verbis utamur: "Praedicatori duo sunt permaxime necessaria, videlicet ut sententiis doctrinae spiritualis exuberet, et religiosae vitae splendore coruscet. Quod si sacerdos quispiam ad utrumque non sufficit, ut et vita clarus et doctrinae

²⁵ Ibid., 9, 16.

²⁶ 2 Cor., 7, 4.

²⁷ Act., 9, 11.

²⁸ 1 Cor., 13, 1.

²⁹ Ibid., 3, 6.

facultate sit profluus; melior est vita procul dubio quam doctrina. . . . Plus valet vitae claritas ad exemplum, quam eloquentia vel urbanitas accurata sermonum. . . . Necesse est ut sacerdos, qui praedicationis officio fungitur, et doctrinae spiritualis imbribus pluat, et religiosae vitae radiis splendeat: instar illius Angeli, qui natum Dominum pastoribus nuntians, et splendore claritatis emicuit, et quod evangelizare venerat, verbis expressit.”⁸⁰

Sed, ut ad Paulum redeamus, si quaerimus quibus de rebus consuevisset praedicando agere, ipse sic omnia complectitur: *Non enim iudicavi me scire aliquid inter vos, nisi Iesum Christum, et hunc crucifixum.*⁸¹ Efficere ut Iesum Christum homines magis magisque cognoscerent et quidem cognitione quae ad vivendum, non modo ad credendum, pertineret, hoc est quod omni apostolici pectoris contentione laboravit. Itaque Christi dogmata et praecepta omnia vel severiora sic tradebat ut nihil nec reticeret nec molliret, de humilitate, de abnegatione sui, de castitate, de rerum humanarum contemptu, de obedientia, de venia inimicis danda, de similibus. Nec vero timide illa denuntiabat: inter Deum et Belial eligendum esse cui serviatur, utrique non posse; omnes, ut e vivis excesserint, tremendum manere iudicium; cum Deo non licere transigi; aut vitam aeternam sperandam, si universae obtemperetur legi, aut, si cupiditatibus indulgendo deseratur officium, ignem aeternum esse exspectandum. Neque enim *Praedicator veritatis* unquam putavit abstinendum ab huiusmodi argumentis propterea quia, ob corruptionem temporum, nimis dura viderentur iis, ad quos loquebatur.—Apparet igitur quam non probandi sint ii praedicatores, qui quaedam christianae doctrinae capita, ne fastidio sint audientibus, non audent attingere. Num medicus quisquam inutilia remedia dabit aegrotanti, quia is ab utilibus abhorreat? Ceterum inde probabitur oratoris virtus et facultas, si, quae ingrata sunt, ea grata dicendo reddiderit.

Quae autem tractanda susceperat, quo modo Apostolus explicabat? *Non in persuasibilibus humanae sapientiae verbis.*⁸²

⁸⁰ Epp. lib. I, *Ep. I ad Cinthium Urbis Praef.*

⁸¹ I *Cor.*, 2, 2.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 2, 4.

Quanti refert, venerabiles Fratres, hoc omnibus esse exploratissimum, cum videmus non paucos e sacris concionatoribus ita dicere ut Scripturas Sanctas, Patres Doctoresque Ecclesiae, theologiae sacrae argumenta praetermittant; nihil fere nisi rationem loquantur. Perperam profecto: neque enim in ordine supernaturali humanis tantum adminiculis quidquam proficitur. —At illud opponitur: praedicatori qui quae divinitus revelata sunt, urgeat, non haberi fidem.—Itane vero? Sit sane apud acatholicos: quamquam cum Graeci sapientiam, nimirum huius saeculi, quaerent, Apostolus tamen eis Christum crucifixum praedicabat.³³ Quod si oculos convertamus ad gentes catholicas, in his ii qui alieni sunt a nobis, fere Fidei radicem retinent: mentem enim obcaecantur eo quod animi corrumpuntur.

Postremo qua mente praedicabat Paulus? Non ut hominibus, sed ut Christo placeret: *Si hominibus placerem, Christi servus non essem.*³⁴ Cum animum gereret incensum caritate Christi, nihil quaerebat praeter Christi gloriam. O utinam qui in verbi ministerio elaborant, omnes vere Iesum Christum diligant; utinam possint illa usurpare Pauli: *Propter quem* (Iesum Christum) *omnia detrimentum feci;*³⁵ et *Mihi vivere Christus est.*³⁶ Tantum qui amore ardent, ceteros inflammare sciunt. Quare S. Bernardus ita praedicatorem admonet: “Si sapis, concham te exhibebis et non canalem”;³⁷ hoc est: quod dicis, eo plenus ipse esto, et ne satis habeas in alios transfundere. “Verum, ut idem Doctor addit, canales hodie in Ecclesia multos habemus, conchas vero perpaucas!”³⁸

Hoc ne eveniat in posterum, vobis omni ope atque opera enitendum est, venerabiles Fratres: quorum est et indignos repellendo, et idoneos eligendo, conformando, moderando, efficere ut praedicatores, qui sint secundum Dei cor, iam plurimi existant.—Respiciat autem misericors gregem suum Pastor aeternus, Iesus Christus, Virgine Sanctissima quidem, ut Matre augusta ipsius Verbi incarnati et Regina Apostolorum, deprecante; ac spiritum apostolatus in Clero refovens, plurimos esse

³³ 1 Cor., 1, 22, 23.

³⁴ Gal., 1, 10.

³⁵ Philip., 3, 8.

³⁶ Ibid., 1, 21.

³⁷ In Cant. serm. 18.

³⁸ Ibid.

iubeat qui studeant "seipsos probabiles exhibere Deo, operarios inconfusibiles, recte tractantes verbum veritatis." ³⁹

Auspiciem divinorum munerum ac testem benevolentiae Nostrae vobis, venerabiles Fratres, vestroque Clero ac populo apostolicam benedictionem peramanter impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die xv iunii, in festo Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu, anno MCMXVII, Pontificatus Nostri tertio.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

SACRA CONGREGATIO CONSISTORIALIS.

NORMAE PRO SACRA PRAEDICATIONE.

Ut quae Beatissimus Pater nuper in Encyclicis Litteris *Humani generis redemptionem* de sacra praedicatione docuit ac praestituit ad praxim facilius deducantur, Eminentissimi Patres S. C. Consistoriali praepositi, ipso Summo Pontifice plene adprobante, sequentes sancivere normas, quibus Rmi locorum Ordinarii uti debeant ut tuto in re tam gravi procedant; easque eadem Sanctitas Sua statim executioni mandandas praecipit, quo scilicet quod Apostolus nominat *ministerium verbi* eos afferat fructus in tuitionem ac propagationem fidei christianaeque vitae custodiam, quales et divinus Magister Christus intendit et catholica Ecclesia sibi iure promittit.

CAPUT I.

A quibus et qua ratione praedicatores Verbi Dei sint eligendi.

1. Rmi locorum Ordinarii illud ante omnia semper prae oculis habeant, quod Sacra Tridentina Synodus, anteriores praescriptiones innovans ac perstringens, cap. IV, sess. 24, *De Reform.*, sancit; ubi, postquam monuit *praedicationis munus Episcoporum praecipuum* esse, sic sequitur: *Mandat* (S. Synodus) *ut in Ecclesia sua ipsi* (Episcopi) *per se, aut, si legitime impediti fuerint, per eos quos ad praedicationis officium assument; in aliis autem Ecclesiis per parochos, sive, iis impeditis, per alios ab Episcopis (impensis eorum qui eas praestare aut tenentur vel solent) deputandos, in civitate aut in quacumque parte dioecesis censebunt expedire, saltem dominicis et solemnioribus diebus festis . . . sacras Scripturas divinam-*

³⁹ 2 Tim., 2, 15.

que legem annuntient. Nullus autem saecularis sive regularis, etiam in Ecclesiis suorum Ordinum, contradicente Episcopo, praedicare praesumat.

Quod plane in novo ecclesiastico Codice confirmatur can. 1327, 1328 et 1337.

2. Cum igitur ad Episcopum loci Ordinarium praedicandi munus praecipue spectet, cumque ad eundem pertineat *assumere* ac *deputare* qui ipsum substituant proque ipso suppleant in hoc gravissimo ministerio, etiam specificè in casu quo praedicationis impensae, aut ex iure aut ex consuetudine, ab aliis sint persolvendae; nullus nec valide nec licite eligere aut advocare concionatorem quempiam etiam pro ecclesia propria; nullusque de clero sive saeculari sive regulari, huiusmodi invitationem licite acceptare poterit, nisi intra limites ac modos in sequentibus articulis statutos.

3. Parochi, vi missionis habitae in eorum electione, sicut ad confessiones excipiendas habilitantur, ita etiam facultate concionandi gaudent, salva quidem lege residentiae salvisque conditionibus ceteris, quas Ordinarius necessario vel utiliter apponendas censuerit. Idem de Canonico Theologo dicendum quoad lectiones Scripturae sacrae.

4. In reliquis casibus universis, ad praedicandum populo fidelium in publicis templis vel oratoriis, etiam regularium, et a sacerdotibus etiam regularibus, necesse est ut facultas obtineatur ab Ordinario dioecesis.

5. Huiusmodi facultas, ad normam eorum quae in Codice praescribuntur can. 1341, § 1 et 2, petenda est:

(a) a prima Capituli dignitate, audito tamen Capitulo, pro praedicationibus, quae ex lege vel voluntate Capituli fiant in ecclesia propria;

(b) a Superiore regulari, servatis respectivi Ordinis vel Congregationis regulis, pro ecclesiis religionum clericalium.

(c) a parócho pro ecclesia parochiali aliisque ecclesiis ab ea dependentibus;

(d) et si agatur de parócho ecclesiae spectantis ad Capitulum vel ad Ordinem religiosum, ab eodem parócho pro concionibus quae ab ipso pendent, secluso Capituli vel religionis interventu;

(e) a sacerdote primicerio vel capellano confraternitatis cuiuslibet pro ecclesia propria;

(f) a sacerdote ecclesiae rectore, quique sacras ibidem functiones de iure peragit, pro omnibus ecclesiis aliarum corporationum moralium non clericalium, aut religionum laicalium, monialium, privatorum.

6. Ad tramitem decisionum S. C. Concilii in *Sutrina*, 8 maii 1688, et in *Ripana*, 21 maii 1707, qui praedictam facultatem postulat, debet tantum concionatoris nomen proponere, idque subordinate ad beneplacitum Ordinarii, qui solus uti potest verbis *eligimus et deputamus ad postulationem* N. N., etc.

7. Postulatio ad obtinendum concionatorem aliquem facienda est tempore utili et opportuno, ut Ordinarius commode queat informationes necessarias de eiusdem persona habere (Codic., can. 1341, § 2) : hoc autem tempus, generatim loquendo, haud erit inferius duobus mensibus, uti iam statuit S. C. Concilii in *Theanen.*, 19 aprilis 1728 et 30 aprilis 1729; salva tamen Episcopis facultate tempus aliud statuendi etiam brevius pro genere et gravitate praedicationis et pro qualitate concionatoris, dioecesani vel extradioecesani.

8. Quicumque, obligatione petendi facultatem posthabita, sacerdotem quempiam ad concionandum invitaverit; itemque sacerdos quilibet, qui tali modo invitatus scienter acceptarit et concionatus fuerit, puniendi sunt ab Ordinario poenis eius arbitrio statuendis, non exclusa suspensione a divinis.

9. Facultas praedicandi, quando agitur de concionatore extradioecesano, scripto tribuenda erit, designato etiam loco et genere praedicationis, pro quibus concessa fuerit.

10. Ordinarii, *onerata graviter eorum conscientia*, facultatem concionandi nemini concedent, nisi prius ipsis constiterit de illius pietate, scientia et idoneitate, secundum praescriptiones quae sequenti capite tradentur: si vero agitur de sacerdotibus extradioecesanis vel de religiosis cuiuscumque Ordinis, nisi prius respectivum Ordinarium et Superiorem interpellaverint ac responsionem favorabilem habuerint.

11. Ordinarius et Superior regularis, qui ab alio Ordinario de informationibus interrogati fuerint circa pietatem, scientiam atque idoneitatem ad praedicandum cuiuspiam eorum subditi, tenentur *sub gravi* eas pro veritate tradere, secundum scientiam et conscientiam prout in can. 1341, § 1, novi Codicis praescribitur. Ordinarius vero qui illas recipit, tenetur eisdem se conformare, secretum de acceptis notitiis absolute servando.

12. Ordinarius qui, ob informationes ut supra acceptas aut aliam ob causam, censuerit in Domino concionandi facultatem alicui denegare, sufficit ut idipsum petenti facultatem significet quin aliud addat, *soli Deo rationem de sua sententia redditurus*.

CAPUT II.

Quo pacto constare debeat de idoneitate concionatoria.

13. Generatim loquendo, sicut adtribuendam sacerdoti cuius facultatem pro ministerio excipiendi fidelium confessiones Ordinarii arctissime obligantur certitudinem acquirere de eius idoneitate et culpa se innexos reputarent si ad tantum munus admitterent qui moribus foret indignus, vel scientiae debitae defectu incapax; ita et non aliter iidem Ordinarii debent se gerere, antequam aliquem assumant et destinent ad ministerium verbi.

14. Medium ordinarium ad dignoscendam cuiuspiam idoneitatem ad praedicationis officium, praesertim quoad scientiam et quoad actionem, est examen a candidato voce et scripto subeundum coram tribus examinadoribus, qui arbitrio Ordinarii possunt seligi vel inter examinadores synodales vel etiam inter sacerdotes extradioecesanos, aut etiam e clero regulari.

Cognita autem idoneitate quoad scientiam et actionem, vel etiam in antecessum, haud minori studio, imo etiam maiori, inquireret Ordinarius num idem candidatus pietate, honestate morum et publica aestimatione dignus sit qui verbum Dei evangelizet.

15. Pro huiusmodi duplicis examinis exitu, poterit Ordinarius candidatum declarare idoneum aut generatim aut pro aliqua solummodo praedicationis specie, ad tempus vel ad experimentum et certis sub conditionibus, aut absolute et non in perpetuum, dando illi *pagellam* praedicationis, ea omnino ratione qua datur pro confessionibus, vel ei facultatem praedicandi simpliciter denegando.

16. Non prohibentur tamen Ordinarii, in casibus particularibus et per exceptionem, quominus aliquem ad praedicandum, sine praevio examine de quo supra, admittant, dummodo aliis iisque certis argumentis de eius idoneitate constet.

17. Vetitum tamen absolute esto *diplomata*, ut aiunt, *praedicationis* subditis non propriis impertiri, vel subditis etiam propriis sed honoris titulo aut in aestimationis signum.

18. Servata, pro regularibus et religiosis exemptis, eorum Ordinariis facultate deputandi subditos, quos secundum regulas et constitutiones Ordinis noverint dignos et idoneos, conformiter tamen semper ad praescriptiones Codicis, can. 1338, ad praedicandum intra septa domus religiosae vel monasterii; si tamen destinare aliquem voluerint ad conciones habendas in publicis ecclesiis, *non exclusis Ordinis propriis*, tenentur illum coram dioecesano loci Ordinario sistere ad examen subeundum iuxta superius disposita articulis 13, 14, 15.

CAPUT III.

Quid in sacra praedicatione servandum sit vel vitandum.

19. Quoniam *sancta sancte tractanda sunt*, nemo praedicationem suscipiat quin digne ac proxime se praeparaverit studio simul et oratione.

20. Argumenta concionum sint essentialiter sacra (Cod. can. 1347). Quod si concionator alia argumenta tractare voluerit non stricte sacra, semper tamen domui Dei convenientia, facultatem a loci Ordinario petere et obtinere debebit; qui quidem Ordinarius eam numquam concedet nisi re mature considerata eiusque necessitate perspecta. Concionatoribus tamen omnibus de re politica in ecclesiis agere omnino et absolute sit vetitum.

21. Elogia funebria nemini recitare fas esto nisi praevio et explicito consensu Ordinarii, qui quidem, antequam consensum praebeat, poterit etiam exigere ut sibi manuscriptum exhibeatur.

22. Concionator prae oculis semper habeat et in praxim deducat quae S. Hieronymus Nepotiano commendabat: *Divinas Scripturas saepius lege: imo nunquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur . . . Sermo presbyteri Scripturarum lectione conditus sit*. Studio autem Scripturarum sacrarum iungatur studium Patrum ac Doctorum Ecclesiae.

23. Citationes ac testimonia scriptorum aut auctorum prophanorum sobrietate summa adhibeantur, multoque magis dicta haereticorum, apostatarum et infidelium: nunquam vero personarum viventium auctoritates proferantur. Fides et christiana morum honestas non his egent adsertoribus ac defensoribus.

24. Concionator ne plausus auditorum aucupetur, sed quaerat unice animarum salutem et commendationem a Deo atque

Ecclesia. *Docente te in ecclesia non clamor populi, sed gemitus suscitetur. Lacrymae auditorum laudes tuae sint* (Hieron. ad Nepotian.).

25. Usus, qui alicubi invaluit, ephemerides vel plagulas typis impressas adhibendi tum ad auditores aucupandos ante praedicationem, tum post praedicationem ad concionatoris meritum extollendum, reprobandus omnino est et damnandus, quovis id praetextu boni fiat. Curent Ordinarii, quantum poterint, ut ne id usuveniat.

26. Quoad actionem in concionando nil melius praescribi potest quam quod S. Hieronymus Nepotianum admonebat: *Nolo te declamatorem et rabulam garrulumque sine ratione, sed mysteriorum peritum et sacramentorum Dei eruditissimum. Verba volvere, et celeritate dicendi apud imperitum vulgus admirationem sui facere, indoctorum hominum est. . . . Nihil tam facile quam vilem plebeculam et indoctam concionem linguae volubilitate decipere, quae quidquid non intelligit plus miratur.*

27. Quamobrem concionator tam in ratiocinatione quam in linguae usu sese communi auditorum captui accomodet; quoad vero actionem ac recitationem, eam observet modestiam et gravitatem, quae illi convenit qui pro Christo legatione fungitur.

28. Caveat item semper ac diligentissime ne sacram praedicationem in quaestum vertat, quaerendo quae sua sunt, non quae Iesu Christi; ne sit igitur *turpis lucri cupidus* nec vanae gloriolae lenocinio se capi sinat.

Nunquam vero ex animo permittat excidere quod, secundum Evangelii et Apostolorum doctrinam et Sanctorum exempla, idem Hieronymus Nepotiano suggerebat: *Non confundant opera tua sermonem tuum; ne cum in ecclesia loqueris, tacitus quilibet respondeat: Cur ergo haec quae dicis, ipse non facis? —Delicatus magister est qui, pleno ventre, de ieiuniis loquitur . . . Sacerdotis os, mens manusque concordent.*

CAPUT IV.

Cui et quomodo interdicenda praedicatio.

29. Concionatores, qui praescriptiones superiori capite editas negligant, si emendationis spem praebeant et graviter non of-

fenderint, prima alterave vice ab Episcopo moneantur ac reprehendantur.

30. Si vero emendationem neglexerint aut graviter cum fidelium scandalo peccaverint, Episcopus, ad tramitem Codicis, can. 1340, §§ 2 et 3—

(a) si agatur de proprio subdito aut de religioso cui praedicandi facultatem ipse dederit, concessam facultatem, nullo hominum respectu, aut ad tempus revocet aut omnino abroget;

(b) si autem de sacerdote extradioecesano agatur vel de religioso cui non ipse *pagellam* impertiverit, praedicationem illi in dioecesi sua interdicat simulque de re moneat tam Ordinarium proprium quam eum qui *praedicationis pagellam* eidem concessit; in casibus autem gravioribus ne omittat ad S. Sedem referre;

(c) poterit etiam Episcopus, imo et debet pro diversitate casuum, concionatore graviter peccante, coeptam praedicationem ipsi intercipere.

31. Interdici pariter praedicatione oportet, *saltem ad tempus et pro aliquo loco*, quicumque aut pro sua vivendi ratione aut quavis alia de causa, etsi inculpabiliter, publicam bonam existimationem amiserit, ita ut ministerium suum inutile vel damnosum evaserit.

32. Ordinarii dioecesani commissionem vigilantiae pro praedicatione, unusquisque in sua dioecesi, instituent, quae iisdem sacerdotibus componi poterit ac commissio pro examine candidatorum.

33. Quia vero nec Episcopi nec commissio vigilantiae adesse ubique in dioecesi poterunt; quum agetur de praedicationibus maioris momenti in locis dissitis, Ordinarii exigent his desuper a Vicariis Foraneis vel a parochis informationes peculiares et tutas iuxta normas superius traditas.

CAPUT V.

De praeparatione remota ad ministerium praedicationis.

34. Ordinarii et Superiores religiosorum stricte obligantur proprios clericos ad sanctam salutaremque praedicationem ab ipsa iuvenili aetate formare studiorum tempore, tum ante tum post susceptum sacerdotium.

35. Curabunt igitur ut dicti clerici, dum sacrae theologiae dant operam, de variis praedicationum generibus doceantur;

praeque manibus habeant et gustent exemplaria insignia quae in omni concionum genere Sancti Patres reliquerunt, praeter illa quae in sacris Evangeliiis, in Actibus et Epistolis Apostolorum ubique accesserunt.

36. Studebunt item Ordinarii ut iuvenes instituantur de actione et pronuntiatione in concionibus servandis, ut eam deinde gravitatem, simplicitatem et concinnitatem praeseferant, quae nihil histrionem sapiat, sed verbo Dei conveniat, probetque concionantem pro animi persuasione et ex corde loqui sublimemque spectare finem, qui ministerio suo est praestitutus.

37. Haec dum in seminariis vel studiorum locis peragentur, Superiores scrutabuntur quod genus praedicationis singulorum alumnorum dispositioni magis respondeat, ut deinde ea super re ad Ordinarium referant.

38. Initialem autem institutionem, quam clerici in seminariis vel in studiorum domibus habuerunt, Ordinarii, etiam post sacros Ordines susceptos, perficiendam curabunt.

39. Quamobrem, iuxta informationes de unoquoque habitas, eos facilioribus primum ac humilioribus praedicationibus occupabunt et exercebunt, ut in tradenda pueris christiana catechesi, Evangelio breviter explicando, iisque similibus.

40. Poterunt demum Ordinarii suis clericis praescribere ut, aliquo annorum spatio, examen de praedicatione in curia quotannis subeant tam voce quam scripto, ea quidem methodo quae ipsis magis probabitur, conformiter scilicet ad praescriptiones Codicis pro examinibus annuis a clericis subeundis post sacerdotii susceptionem.

Ex S. C. Consistoriali die 28 iunii, in pervigilio SS. App. Petri et Pauli anno 1917.

✠ C. CARD. DE LAI, Ep. Sabinen., *Secretarius*.

L. * S.

† V. Sardi, Archiep. Caesarien., *Adessor*.

SACRA CONGREGATIO RITUUM.

I.

DE SACRA UNCTIONE MANUS IN ORDINATIONE.

R. D. S. Kyne, missionarius in civitate Lugdunensi degens, Sacrae Rituum Congregationi sequentia dubia solvenda humiliter proposuit, nimirum:

I. An per verbum *palmas*, de quo Pontificale Romanum, loquens de unctione manuum presbyteri, dicit: *ungit totaliter palmas*, intelligenda sit tantum illa pars manus quae sese extendit a brachio usque ad digitos vel comprehendi debeant etiam tres digiti qui dicuntur medius, annularis et minimus?

II. *Et quatenus negative ad secundam partem*, unctio in ordinatione extendine debet usque ad extremum horum trium digitorum vel restringi ad illam partem manus quae vulgo dicitur *palma manus*, id est quae sese extendit a brachio usque ad digitos exclusive?

III. Utrum sacerdos miles cui ablati est index in bello, obtenta permissione celebrandi *cum medio*, indigeat unctione istius digiti medii priusquam celebret?

Ratio dubitandi est quia quidam theologi dicunt unctionem non requiri eo quod tota manus in ordinatione consecrata est, sed rubrica de unctione manuum in pontificali non loquitur de *manu* sed de *palma*.

Et Sacra Rituum Congregatio, audito specialis Commissionis suffragio, respondendum censuit:

Ad I. Intelligenda est pars interior manus inclusis digitis, ad mentem Rubricae et formulae Pontificalis Romani.

Ad II. Provisum in I.

Ad III. *Negative* et acquiescat.

Atque ita rescripsit, die 12 ianuarii 1917.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. Pro-Praefectus.

L. * S.

Alexander Verde, *Secretarius*.

II.

DE INSTRUMENTIS "CAMPANE TUBOLARI" IN ORGANO.

Rmus Dnus Episcopus Tarvisinus Sacrae Rituum Congregationi sequens dubium pro opportuna solutione proposuit; nimirum:

Utrum organo ad usum liturgicum adhibito adiungere liceat instrumenta vulgo vocata *Campane tubolari*?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, attento Motu Proprio sa. me. Pii Papae X, *De musica sacra*, n. 4121, diei 21 novembris 1903, tit. VI, n. 18 et 12, una cum subsequentibus declarationibus,

atque audito specialis Commissionis suffragio, respondendum censuit: *Negative*.

Atque ita rescripsit ac declaravit, die 18 maii 1917.

✠ A. CARD. VICO, Ep. Portuen. et S. Rufinae,
S. R. C. *Pro-Praefectus*.

L. * S.

Alexander Verde, *Secretarius*.

ROMAN CURIA.

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

14 May: The Right Rev. Michael Thomas Labrecque, D.D., Bishop of Chicoutimi, made assistant at the Pontifical Throne.

3 July: Mr. Humbert Louis Leicester, of the Archdiocese of Birmingham, made Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great (civil class).

13 July: The Right Rev. Joseph M. Koudelka, D.D., Bishop of Superior, made assistant at the Pontifical Throne.

17 July: Monsignor Colin Chisholm, of the diocese of Antigonish, made Domestic Prelate of the Pope.

23 July: Dr. Charles Joseph Reginald O'Reilly, of the archdiocese of Westminster, made Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great (civil class).

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALEOTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

ENCYCLICAL LETTER of Pope Benedict XV on preaching.

S. CONSISTORIAL CONGREGATION announces the new regulations on preaching. (A commentary on this and the preceding document will be found above, pp. 377-389.)

SACRED CONGREGATION OF RITES answers doubts (1) about the anointing of the hands at ordination; and (2) concerning the use in liturgical services of an organ equipped with tubular chimes.

ROMAN CURIA gives official list of recent Pontifical appointments.

THE DUTY OF PASTORS TOWARD OUR CATHOLIC SOLDIERS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Now that there is all the needed evidence to show us that our country is at war and that many of our Catholic soldiers, who have already crossed the seas, are preparing themselves for the firing line, an imperative duty confronts our pastors at home. These soldiers, who are in training, were our boys. We were their spiritual fathers whilst they were at home and upon us rested the responsibility of guarding their spiritual, and ofttimes their temporal, welfare. Will we now forget them and feel satisfied that we have fewer souls to answer for? No! Surely not.

Our soldier boys have gone away; others are going, and they will be separated from Catholic associations; they will come in contact with companions who will scoff at them if they kneel to pray. Although we cannot presume to say that France has ever lost the Faith, we must know that our soldiers are going to a country where in great part God and His Church and His priests are scorned and all that is sacred and religious is derided. Our duty, therefore, is much more important now than it ever was. These young men must not be left to themselves. Otherwise they will fall into a guilty forgetfulness of their duties.

It is to the priests who know them that we appeal. Each pastor should know the address, location, and whereabouts of his own boys. He should correspond with them, telling them who is their chaplain and encouraging them to keep up their religious duties when on the battlefield.

Before acting we must know. Knowledge precedes action. Christ first chose His disciples. Then He gathered them and gave them the instructions which they were to follow. So it is with Army Chaplains. They must follow their instructions in doing Christ's work. They cannot put a sign on their tents and wait for customers. The chaplain must know his Catholic boys before he can work, and this will be done much more easily if the boys are advised by their respective pastors to go to the chaplain and make themselves known.

Just as it is true that in union there is strength, so weakness comes in separation. Take the average Catholic boy left alone, whether in his parish or outside it; he is surrounded with egotistical ideas, prejudices and contradictions in matters of religion and bad example. Around him are few or no religious practices, and oftentimes, if there be any, they are such as to destroy his faith. Religion is ignored or unknown. Some claim that it is useless; others that it is the ruin of society; by some it is proclaimed as a shield for political purposes. How is he to find the truth alone in the midst of such chaos?

On the other hand, if he belongs to a Catholic club, association or society, where he will meet Catholic young men, where he will find Catholic literature, where he will feel at home, he naturally grows stronger. He will be in a position to answer satisfactorily the daily objections thrown at Catholic boys. A young man is timid and hesitant about approaching the altar-rail to receive Holy Communion when he is alone, but our young men are proud to receive this Holy Sacrament in a body.

In every branch of commerce, in every line of business, we hear of corporations, syndicates, firms, societies, companies, trusts, etc., because business men know that when they unite, their capital will triumph and overcome smaller concerns and monopolize all business and commerce. Likewise in the various liberal professions we find these unions flourishing, such

as the Bar Association, the Medical and Pharmaceutical Societies, and others. If we wish to see strength, however, we must go to the realm of sport. Here we have clubs of all kinds and all varieties. They get the best that is possible, and discard all else, just to count in their numbers the best sportsmen of the country and bring victory to their clubs. Therefore for the preserving, developing and spreading of our religion we must unite our efforts, especially at this time. We must maintain our faith and the faith of our people by public profession. Numbers of people claim they are only indifferent, but they are real fanatics; they have no religion and they will not let others practise their own. They are the children of Robespierre, who said of them, "There are greater fanatics than those who go to Mass; they are those who stop others from going". They ask for themselves the liberty of blasphemy and they deny to others the right of adoration and worship. These are some of the people that will come in contact with the young American Catholic soldier; against these we must prepare him, advise him, strengthen him.

The American soldiers have been received with admiration and joy by the French people. What admiration, what wonder will there be in these true French hearts when they shall see the American chaplain saying Mass and giving Holy Communion to hundreds and thousands of their liberators; but also what curses and blasphemies in the mouths of some of the so-called men of the hour!

Already the work is started. Chaplains have been chosen. Catholic societies, associations and clubs, following the example of the Knights of Columbus, are working to raise the funds necessary to supply the various needs of the Catholic portion of the Army. We must not delay. The need is urgent. The response must come immediately. All Catholics must do their share in their various ways under the guidance of the chaplains.

Few will realize with what anxiety soldiers attend the distribution of the mail in camp. The fortunate ones bubble with joy and contentment even at the sight of a postal card. The disappointed ones return to their tents saying: "Maybe to-morrow I'll have one". What joy would it give them to receive a word from the priest who baptized them, who confessed them, who gave them their first Holy Communion!

Let us go back and think of our days in the Seminary and recall how we felt on those occasions. We are nothing less than a big family. How cheerful is a letter from home to anyone who really loves his parents. It will not be hard on us to write a few pages to these heroes and defenders of our country. The words of the pastor, who, following Christ's example to watch over His own, condescends to write to his former parishioners now serving in the Army, will be listened to and a mighty harvest will be reaped.

Everything that is done is done for Truth, Justice, and Charity; for Time and Eternity; for souls and for God; that the Catholic soldiers under the Flag will be a power and an attraction—a power commanding respect for their liberty, and an attraction drawing others to the Fold.

ALPHONSUS MARTEL, O.S.A.

Chicago, Ill.

CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE AT THE MASSES ON SUNDAYS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In a recent number of the REVIEW, C. M., after adverting to the ignorance of the principal doctrines of faith on the part of "quite a number of the faithful", suggests that it might "be well for the pastor to introduce the practice of reading to his congregation, every Sunday, immediately before the regular sermon or instruction, in a form at once clear and brief, the more important truths of religion".

To prove that such a practice would not be an innovation, he refers to the advice given by Père Lejeune to pastors, and cites "the ancient and constant practice in Ireland for the officiating priests to read aloud, every Sunday, immediately before the celebration of the Divine Mysteries, the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, and a prayer before Mass, in which certainly the chief truths of religion are clearly expressed".

The idea contained in C. M.'s suggestion, far from being an innovation, is embodied in the decrees of many ancient and modern diocesan synods as well as provincial and national councils. Thus, to give a couple of instances, in 1281, the Synod of Lambeth commanded pastors to give instruction in Christian Doctrine, and to repeat the same four times a year.

"We order," says the Synod, "that every priest in charge of a flock, do four times a year, on one or more solemn festivals, either personally or by some one else, instruct the people in the vulgar tongue, simply and without any admixture of subtle distinctions, in the fourteen articles of the Creed, the Ten Commandments of the Decalogue, the two precepts of the Gospel, that is, of true charity, the Seven Deadly Sins with their offshoots, the Seven Principal Virtues, and the Seven Sacraments."

In 1429, the Synod of Tortosa, in Spain, directed "that bishops should draw up abridgments of Christian Doctrine so arranged that the text might be explained in seven or eight lessons; and it commanded parish priests to explain the same to the people several times a year on Sundays and festivals."

Similar abridgments of Christian Doctrine are read at regular intervals in the year in many of the dioceses of continental Europe to the present day.

As C. M. asks his brethren in the ministry to help in the matter by "kindly counsel and suggestion", permit me to give the readers of the REVIEW a summary of Christian Doctrine which could be read to the faithful at least on certain Sundays during the year. This summary might serve as a basis for discussion and finally result in a formula that might appeal to those whose duty it is to instruct the faithful. The subjoined formula closely follows the general idea of an instruction which, for generations past, has been read once a month in all the churches of the well regulated diocese of Bruges, Belgium. Needless to add, the proposed formula has been adapted to our Baltimore Catechism. The remarks on the new marriage law are the regulations which have been ordered read at all Masses on Sundays and holidays of obligation in the Diocese of Helena.

In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Beloved Brethern:

Our most important duty on earth is to save our souls, because we thereby secure the possession of God and of everlasting happiness in the life to come. This is what our blessed Lord Jesus Christ calls "the one thing necessary." To save our souls, we must wor-

ship God by faith, hope, and charity; that is, we must believe in Him, hope in Him, and love Him with all our heart. The general objects and reasons of our faith, hope, and charity, are set forth in the Acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity:

AN ACT OF FAITH.

O my God! I firmly believe that Thou art one God, in three Divine Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; I believe that Thy Divine Son became man, and died for our sins, and that He will come to judge the living and the dead. I believe these and all the truths which the Holy Catholic Church teaches, because Thou hast revealed them, who canst neither deceive nor be deceived.

AN ACT OF HOPE.

O my God! relying on Thy infinite goodness and promises, I hope to obtain pardon of my sins, the help of Thy grace, and life everlasting, through the merits of Jesus Christ, my Lord and Redeemer.

AN ACT OF LOVE.

O my God! I love Thee above all things, with my whole heart and soul, because Thou art all-good and worthy of all love. I love my neighbor as myself for the love of Thee. I forgive all who have injured me, and ask pardon of all whom I have injured.

We shall know the things which we are to believe from the Catholic Church, through which God speaks to us. We shall find the chief truths which the Church teaches in the Apostles' Creed, made by the Apostles before the dispersion among the nations of the earth, (and divided into twelve articles).

APOSTLES' CREED.

I believe in God, the Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth; and in Jesus Christ, His only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified; died, and was buried. He descended into hell; the third day He rose from the dead; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the living and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the communion of Saints, the forgiveness of

sins, the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.

What we must hope and ask of God, for both body and soul, is contained in the Lord's prayer, so called because it was taught us by our Lord Himself.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name; Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; Give us this day our daily bread; and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen.

After the Our Father, we usually recite the Hail Mary, to offer our prayer to God through her intercession. This prayer is called the Angelical Salutation, because its first part was spoken by the Angel Gabriel. Its second part was uttered by St. Elizabeth in greeting the Blessed Virgin. The third part was added by our Holy Mother, the Church, in the general Council of Ephesus, A. D. 431.

THE ANGELICAL SALUTATION.

Hail Mary, full of grace! the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now and at the hour of our death. Amen.

To give proof of our love of God, we must keep the Commandments of God, and the precepts of the Church, shun sin, above all, mortal sin, which deprives our souls of spiritual life, which is sanctifying grace, and brings everlasting death and damnation on the soul.

The Commandments of God are these ten:

1. I am the Lord thy God. Thou shalt not have strange gods before Me.
2. Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.
3. Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath day.
4. Honor thy father and thy mother.
5. Thou shalt not kill.
6. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
7. Thou shalt not steal.
8. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.
9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife.
10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods.

God, Himself, imprinted these commandments upon the heart of man from the beginning. Later, He gave them to Moses on Mount Sinai, and Christ our Lord confirmed them.

The chief Commandments of the Church are six :

1. To hear Mass on Sundays and holidays of obligation.
2. To fast and abstain on the days appointed.
3. To confess at least once a year.
4. To receive the Holy Eucharist during the Easter time.
5. To contribute to the support of our pastors.
6. Not to marry persons who are not Catholics, or who are related to us within the fourth degree of kindred, nor privately without witnesses, nor to solemnize marriage at forbidden times.

In order to fulfill these our Christian duties, we are in need of the Grace of God, which we may obtain by prayer, almsgiving, and other good works, but especially by the frequent and devout reception of the Sacraments. There are seven Sacraments instituted by Christ to give grace, viz: Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, Holy Eucharist, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders and Matrimony.

Baptism and Penance are called Sacraments of the dead, because they take away sin, which is the death of the soul. Confirmation, Holy Eucharist, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony, are called Sacraments of the living, because those who receive them worthily are already living the life of grace.

Baptism is a Sacrament which cleanses us from original sin, makes us Christians, children of God, and heirs of heaven. Baptism is necessary to salvation, because without it we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven. The priest is the ordinary minister of Baptism; but in case of necessity any one who has the use of reason may baptize. Whoever baptizes should pour water on the head of the person to be baptized, and say, while pouring the water: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Confirmation is a Sacrament through which we receive the Holy Ghost to make us strong and perfect Christians and soldiers of Jesus Christ. The Bishop is the ordinary minister of Confirmation.

Penance is a Sacrament in which the sins committed after baptism are forgiven. To receive the Sacrament of Penance worthily we must do five things: 1. we must examine our conscience; 2. we must have sorrow for our sins; 3. we must take a firm resolution never more to offend God; 4. we must confess our sins to the priest; 5. we must accept the penance which the priest gives us. While the priest is giving us absolution, we should from our heart renew the Act of Contrition.

ACT OF CONTRITION.

O my God! I am heartily sorry for having offended Thee, and I detest all my sins, because I dread the loss of heaven and the pains of hell, but most of all because they offend Thee, my God, who art all-good and deserving of all my love. I firmly resolve, with the help of Thy grace, to confess my sins, to do penance, and to amend my life.

The Holy Eucharist is the Sacrament which contains the Body and Blood, soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ under the appearances of bread and wine.

Our Blessed Lord instituted the Holy Eucharist at the Last Supper, in the presence of the twelve Apostles, by taking bread, blessing, breaking, and giving it to His Apostles, saying: "Take ye and eat. This is my body;" and then by taking the cup of wine, blessing and giving it, saying to them: "Drink ye all of this. This is my blood which shall be shed for the remission of sins. Do this for a commemoration of me."

Christ instituted the Holy Eucharist — 1. to unite us to Himself and to nourish our soul with His divine life; 2. to increase sanctifying grace and all virtues in our soul; 3. to lessen our evil inclinations; 4. to be a pledge of everlasting life; 5. to fit our bodies for a glorious resurrection; 6. to continue the sacrifice of the Cross in His Church.

We are united to Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist by means of Holy Communion. To make a good Communion it is necessary to be in the state of sanctifying grace and to be fasting from midnight. It is well to receive Holy Communion often, as nothing is a greater aid to a holy life than often to receive the Author of all grace and the Source of all good.

The bread and wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ at the Consecration in the Mass.

The Mass is the unbloody sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ. The best manner of hearing Mass is to offer it to God with the priest for the same purpose for which it is said, to meditate on Christ's sufferings and death, and to go to Holy Communion.

Extreme Unction is the Sacrament which, through the anointing and prayer of the priest, gives health and strength to the soul, and sometimes to the body, when we are in danger of death from sickness.

Holy Orders is a Sacrament by which bishops, priests, and other ministers of the Church are ordained and receive the power and grace to perform their sacred duties. Christians should look upon the priests of the Church as the messengers of God and the dispensers of His mysteries.

The Sacrament of Matrimony is the Sacrament which unites a Christian man and woman in lawful marriage.

The bond of Christian marriage cannot be dissolved by any human power. Christians should prepare for a holy and happy marriage by receiving the Sacraments of Penance and Holy Eucharist; by begging God to grant them a pure intention and to direct their choice; and by seeking the advice of their parents and the blessing of their pastors.

The rewards or punishments appointed for men's souls after the Particular Judgment are Heaven, Purgatory, and Hell.

We should bear always in mind these words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ: "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul, or what exchange shall a man give for his soul? For the Son of man shall come in the glory of His Father with His angels; and then will He render to every man according to his works."

If a similar summary of Christian Doctrine were read four, six, or more times a year, at all Masses on Sundays, the number of Catholics ignorant of the principal doctrines of the Christian Faith would steadily decrease.

VICTOR DAY.

Helena, Montana.

INTERRUPTION OF MASS AT THE OFFERTORY.

Qu. After reading the curious facts which you mention in the September number under the heading "Two-faced Mass," I began to wonder whether, under any circumstances, it is allowed to interrupt the Mass at the Offertory and begin another. It seems to me that this is sometimes permitted.

Resp. Theologians teach that before the Offertory the Mass may be interrupted "*ex causa mediocriter gravi*" and afterward continued, or a new Mass may be begun. Thus, Lehmkühl¹ holds that, if a priest has begun a low Mass, and, before the Offertory, word is brought to him that the priest who is to celebrate the High Mass at a later hour is prevented from celebrating, he may discontinue the low Mass and, later, begin the High Mass. This is preferred to the alternative of finishing the low Mass and beginning by celebrating the High Mass.

¹ *Theol. Moralis*, II, 339.

Noldin² holds that Mass may be interrupted before the Offertory and begun at the beginning "in adventu principis, peregrinorum, processionis," if otherwise the newcomers could not fulfill the obligation of hearing Mass.

PRIMARY AND SECONDARY INTENTION AT MASS.

Qu. Recently I gave fifteen Mass intentions to a brother priest to be said as specified in the will of a person deceased. I also mentioned that the Masses were for the dead, for friends of the deceased, specified in the will. Later, he informed me that he had said the Masses primarily for the intention of the will and secondarily "for the poor souls," who were not mentioned or specified thus in the will. Must the Masses be said again to conform to the intention expressed in the will?

Resp. Moral theologians consider the case of primary and secondary intentions in the order of time. Thus, the first intention might be "pro Jacobo defuncto"; and the second, replacing the first, "pro Joanne defuncto." They decide that, if the second intention is meant to revoke the first, it certainly does so. In the case before us, "primary" and "secondary" are used in a different sense, and the so-called secondary intention, not being meant to revoke the first, does not do so. There is, therefore, it seems to us, no further obligation in the matter, although it is very desirable that when an obligation of the kind is assumed, it should be carefully fulfilled in strict accordance with the terms of the will.

MONTHLY OR WEEKLY CONFESSION.

Qu. A pastor of my acquaintance, for whose virtue and learning I have the highest respect, is accustomed to counsel his penitents to content themselves with confession once a month. Some of these penitents are daily communicants, while others receive only on Sundays and holidays. Regarding the latter, a difficulty presents itself. How about the gaining of indulgences? By a decree of Pius X, dated 14 February, 1906, those who go to Holy Communion daily, or nearly every day, may gain all the indulgences occurring during the week (except the Jubilee indulgence) without being obliged to

² *De Sacramentis*, n. 212.

weekly confession. But, for those who communicate only on Sundays this privilege does not obtain. They must confess oftener than once a month if they are to gain the indulgences. To this the pastor replies: "Let it be so. Better far that they should miss the indulgences than that they be prevented from receiving Holy Communion, and it is certain that not a few of them will be kept from Holy Communion if they have to go to confession more than once a month." Now, I ask, do you think that the good pastor is acting wisely? Is his course one that can be safely followed? Does it savor of Jansenism, as he is fond of saying, to counsel one's penitents to go to confession every week? For your opinion on this matter I shall be greatly indebted.

Resp. We can hardly imagine that the conditions described by our correspondent actually exist, namely, that persons who communicate on Sundays and holidays find it impossible, or even very difficult, to go to confession more than once a month. If such conditions do exist, the pastor is justified in "counseling" his penitents to be content with monthly confession and to go to Holy Communion on Sundays and holidays, it being understood of course that he is satisfied not only that his penitents will not dare to approach the Holy Table in the state of mortal sin, but also that they have the dispositions of soul mentioned in the decree of Pius X (16 December, 1905).

In regard to the gaining of indulgences, it is clear that, if it is impossible or difficult to go to confession, the parishioners in the case cannot gain the indulgences, although they do receive Holy Communion.

The allusion to "Jansenism", if seriously meant, is far fetched. The prudent and tactful insistence on weekly confession is not rigorism, nor does it mean the discouragement of frequent Communion. The admission of children to the sacraments at an earlier age than was customary in the past, the encouragement of frequent and even daily Communion on the part of the laity, and all the other enactments of the late Pontiff along similar lines have been referred to as the inculcation of love for our Lord in addition to the reverence which was until recently the keynote of all pastoral instruction in these matters. But love and reverence are not incompatible, and the pastor who, keeping in mind the reverence due to the Blessed Sacrament, tactfully inculcates weekly confession, is not a rigorist.

He does not mean to discourage love for our Lord, and may not justly be accused of Jansenistic rigorism.

PURIFICATION OF THE CHALICE.

Qu. Kindly tell me whether water and wine should be used in purifying the chalice in case of bination in two different places.

Resp. De Herdt, Wapelhorst, and others give explicit directions on this point. They are founded on an official instruction issued by the S. Congregation of Rites, 11 March, 1858. These directions were summarized in the REVIEW for October, 1893 (pages 298 and 299). We quote the following:

5. After the last Gospel the celebrant uncovers the chalice; carefully drains the drops of Precious Blood which have gathered at the bottom.

6. Pours water into the chalice which he empties into a cup prepared for the purpose on the altar.

7. Wipes the chalice with the purifier and covers it, replacing the corporal in the burse.

No wine is used in the ablution. Indeed, Wapelhorst advises that, when the priest intends to celebrate a second Mass, he should, at the Offertory of the first Mass, have the wine cruet removed after pouring the wine into the chalice, lest inadvertently the server may offer it to him after the Communion and he break his fast. Or he may at the Offertory pour all the wine in the cruet into the chalice.

CONDITIONAL ABSOLUTION OF SUICIDE.

Qu. A priest is called to the bedside of a suicide, still living but unconscious. May he give him conditional absolution, anoint him, and afterward bury him from the church?

Resp. In the case of a dying suicide who is unconscious, the principle applies that, although the subject of absolution cannot make an explicit confession of his sins, and is unable to show by any certain sign that he is sorry for them, the will to confess, the explicit sorrow for sins, the wish to be reconciled with God may be presumed, even though the person has not led a good Christian life or has passed into unconscious-

ness in the very act of sinning, as in a duel, in the act of stealing, etc. Conditional absolution may therefore be given.¹ Similarly, Extreme Unction may be administered *sub conditione*. Lehmkuhl says² "Non debent ab extrema unctione excludi . . . si in ipso actu peccati, signo penitentiae non manifestato, sensibus destituuntur". And if conditional absolution and Extreme Unction have been administered, there is no reason why the suicide should not be buried from the church, so long as there is room for the legitimate assumption that his act was due to mental derangement. If the act were clearly a deliberate act, and some sign of repentance were given, Christian burial should be granted. The Holy Office admonishes pastors and missionaries to resolve doubtful cases by referring them, "quoad fieri potest", to the bishop of the diocese. The Holy Office lays down the rule: "Regula est not licere dare ecclesiasticam sepulturam seipsos occidentibus ob desperationem vel iracundiam (non tamen si ex insania id accadat) nisi ante mortem dederint signa poenitentiae."³

THE FORM OF BAPTISM.

Qu. Is the form of Baptism so essential that any change in its wording invalidates the Sacrament? If, for example, the minister should say: "I baptize thee *with* the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," would the child be baptized?

Resp. The form of Baptism is "Ego te baptizo, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti". This was defined by the Council of Trent. In English the form is, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost". Theologians, in answer to the question whether each and every word is essential, hold that, in the Latin form the *ego* may be omitted without loss of validity, and probably also the first *et*. Again, though this is more in dispute, probably the word *in* may be omitted, in the Latin formula. In English, however, the word *I* may not be omitted, because it is necessary in order to express the identity of the minister. Similarly, in English, the preposition seems to be essential. For, al-

¹ Noldin, *De Sacramentis*, n. 293.

² *Theol. Moralis*, II, 724.

³ *Resp.* 16 May, 1866.

though in Latin *nomine* may mean the same as *in nomine*, in English the preposition is required in order to express the meaning. The substitution of *with* for *in* (of *cum* for the Latin *in*) has been authoritatively declared not to vitiate the formula, provided it be used without evil intent. The reason is that "with the name" may be understood to mean "with the authority", which, after all, is the meaning of "in the name". Accordingly we believe that, in the case before us, if there is no evidence of intention to pervert or invalidate the form, the words used are sufficient, and the baptism is valid, and should not be repeated even *sub conditione*.¹

THE CONGREGATION AT MASS.

Qu. Several years ago I read in Vol. XXXVI of the REVIEW a summary of rules for the guidance of a congregation at High Mass. The article reflected perfectly my own views on the subject, and seemed to me to accord best with the practices that obtain in Rome. By dint of constant exhortation, I succeeded in training my people to assist at Mass according to the scheme proposed by the REVIEW. I have since discovered that in no other parish of the diocese does the congregation stand after the Consecration at the High Mass, although the S. Congregation of Rites has declared that the people follow the practice of the choir "*laudabiliter*." At several solemn functions held in our cathedral during the past year, the concourse of priests was so great that many had to remain outside the sanctuary. These priests stood after the Consecration; half the congregation followed their example, while the other half remained kneeling. Also, the choir remained standing during the Communion of the priest, and knelt devoutly during the Communion of the people. And so it goes on. What do you think of this?

Resp. Whilst uniformity is desirable, it is very difficult to obtain, as local customs in matters of this nature are very tenacious. Liturgists are of opinion that, since the Missal gives no explicit rubrical directions for the congregation during High Mass, the instruction to the effect that the congregation may "*laudably*" kneel or stand according as the choir does, is directive, not prescriptive. The custom of kneeling during the distribution of Holy Communion to the congregation during High Mass is a laudable one, and does not seem at all to

¹ See Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Moralis*, I, 89 for authorities and references.

be contradictory to the custom of standing during the Communion of the priest at the altar. The effort of our correspondent to secure uniformity of practice in his own parish cannot be too highly praised, and he should not be discouraged by the lack of similar zeal elsewhere.

PROFESSION OF FAITH.

Qu. When a priest makes his profession of faith or takes the oath "against Modernism," is he obliged to obey the decrees of the Holy See in matters of Christian morality as well as in matters of faith? I hope you will not consider the question irrelevant.

Resp. We cannot help thinking that the question is irrelevant, unless there is some particular point in the mind of our inquirer which he has not expressed. The decrees of the Holy See in matters of Christian morality and discipline impose on all the faithful the obligation of obedience. Moreover, when the Sovereign Pontiff issues a decree *ex cathedra*, there arises the obligation of acceptance, whether the decree have reference to matters of Faith or to matters of conduct. The general obligation of obedience to the decrees of the Church in matters of morals and discipline is not expressly renewed in the oath against Modernism, but the obligation of believing the infallible decrees of the Church in all matters, whether of faith or morals, is. The first sentence of the prescribed oath reads: "Ego . . . firmiter amplector ac recipio *omnia et singula* quae ab inerranti ecclesiae magisterio definita, adserta ac declarata sunt, praesertim ea doctrinae capita quae huius temporis erroribus directo adversantur".

FEMINISM.

Qu. I do not ask you to discuss at length the question of Women's Rights, Equal Suffrage, or what is called Feminism, but would be much obliged if you could direct me to some reading matter which outlines the general principles as understood and taught by Catholic authors.

Resp. The literature on the subject is vast, and is growing every day. One might very well begin with the excellent article on "Woman" by Rössler in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*,

and then go on to Rössler's other works and the volumes by Cathrein and Mausbach, all of which are referred to in the bibliography attached to the article just mentioned. One general principle that should be borne in mind is this: Behind the professed economic, political, educational, social, and hygienic aims of certain feminist associations and their programmes, there is often an ethical, or rather unethical, theory utterly irreconcilable with Christian ideas and ideals. This distinction is clearly made in the works referred to above. English literature on the subject, from our point of view, is not so abundant as it ought to be. You will see this for yourself if you consult the article on "Woman in English-speaking Countries" in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. Since that article was written, however, the Catholic Social Guild of England has published an excellent little manual on the subject by Margaret Fletcher, entitled *Christian Feminism: A Charter of Rights and Duties*. It gives a most judicious and judicial survey of this important and difficult problem, and contains a serviceable bibliography of the subject. There is a brief discussion of some aspects of the problem in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW for 1913 (Vol. XLVIII, pp. 461 and 630).

DISTRIBUTING BAPTISMAL SALT.

Qu. Some of my parishioners are in the habit of asking for portions of salt used in baptism. They say that in the country from which they came, it is customary to use it in food in case of illness. Am I allowed to give it to them? Do you know of any regulation to the contrary? I do not like to refuse, unless I have authority for my action.

Resp. The Rubrics of the Roman Ritual expressly forbid the use of baptismal salt for any other purpose than that for which it is specially blessed. Titulus II, Cap. I, n. 39 reads: "Sal quod in os baptizandi immitendum est sit benedictum sua peculiari benedictione . . . Sal ita benedictum nemini tradatur, neque etiam iis qui benedicendum attulerint reddatur, sed ad alios baptizandos servetur, aut in sacrarium abjiciatur". Commenting on this rubric, O'Kane remarks that it is directed against possible superstitious uses, and adds, "If (people) wish to have some blessed salt, the priest may bless some for

them, using the benediction given in the Ritual or at the end of the Missal 'Ad quodcumque comestibile' ".¹

EXPOSITION OF THE BLESSED SACRAMENT BY SISTERS.

Qu. A fellow priest, commenting on an article in the REVIEW in which you condemned the practice of opening the tabernacle for private adoration of the Blessed Sacrament by a priest in a country place, maintained that Rome has given permission to Sisters to open the tabernacle, when there is no priest to give them Benediction. If Sisters can do this, surely a priest may do so, for his private devotion.

Resp. The reference is probably to a Roman decision on an entirely different matter. The Sisters of St. Clare in the Archdiocese of Cambrai had a custom which the Archbishop of that See described as follows, in a *Dubium* submitted by him to the S. Congregation of Rites in 1885: "Intra parietem qui medius est inter chorum sororum et sanctuarium cellula est praeparata ubi Sanctissima Eucharistia in ostensorio requiescit. Sacerdote absente, Sorores ostium cellulae in choro suo aspiciens aperiunt: adhuc tamen clausum remanet Sanctissimum Sacramentum solido vitro. Sic piaae sorores statutis horis contemplatione Sanctae Hostiae fruuntur." To the question whether this pious custom may be tolerated an affirmative answer was rendered (Decree n. 3648). This is, clearly, an approval of that particular local custom. It is not an approval of the Exposition of the Blessed Sacrament by Sisters, and is not a case of exposition of the Blessed Sacrament for the private devotion of an individual.

GREGORY XII SUCCESSOR OF URBAN VI.

Qu. In the August number of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW (page 198) I find the following statement made by the venerable and learned Father Lehmkuhl, S. J.: "It is, however, beyond doubt that Gregory XII was elected as the successor of Urban VI, etc."

Now in the list of Roman Pontiffs I find that, after the reign of Urban VI, which ended in 1389, Boniface IX was elected in 1389 and reigned until 1404; and that after the death of Boniface IX, Innocent VII was elected in 1404 and reigned until 1406. How

¹ *The Rubrics of the Roman Ritual*, n. 271.

then, I ask, can it be explained or even truthfully stated that Gregory XII was elected as successor of Urban VI, seeing that we have two Roman Pontiffs coming in between the reign of Urban VI and Gregory XII?

Again, in this list of Roman Pontiffs Alexander V is placed between Gregory XII and John XXIII. This is certainly an obscure and involved portion of Church history, and one which, in the words of the venerable Father Lehmkuhl, I would like to see discussed in the pages of the REVIEW by some expert historian and canonist.

A SUBSCRIBER.

Resp. The list of recognized Pontiffs does indeed place Boniface IX and Innocent VII between Urban VI and Gregory XII; so that Gregory's succession may not be considered immediate upon that of Urban. But in view of the fact that with Urban VI began the schism (which created a series of contested elections), Father Lehmkuhl wishes to establish, if we may interpret his statement, the connexion between that Pontiff and Gregory XII, with whose resignation the schism practically ended.

The two elections which precede that of Gregory XII, though legitimate according to the verdict of history, were contested by Gebert de Genève (who was elected at Anagni as Clement VII),¹ and subsequently by Pietro di Luna (elected at Avignon as Benedict XIII).²

When Gregory XII was elected at Rome³ to succeed Innocent VII (who followed Boniface IX), the anti-Popes Benedict XIII, Alexander V,⁴ and later John XXIII, were maintaining opposition, and Father Lehmkuhl wishes to point out that of these contestants Gregory was the legitimate Pontiff until he abdicated in 1415, when the schism practically ended with the subsequent election (in 1417) of Martin V, though Pietro di Luna still maintained his fictitious title of Benedict XIII and a Clement VIII claimed succession to the latter.

¹ A subsequent Pontiff (Julius de Medici) adopted the title of Clement VII as recognized Pope in 1523.

² In 1721 Cardinal Orsini took the name Benedict XIII as Pope.

³ Resident at Gaeta.

⁴ Resident at Perpignano and Pisa respectively.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

CHRISTOLOGICAL THEORIES 25.

RITSCHLIANISM 1.

In setting forth the various Christological tendencies of to-day, we have frequently referred to Albrecht Ritschl (1822-1889). His influence is a dominating factor in the psychological school of Christology; hence the Ritschlian Christology calls for special consideration.

I. Origin of Ritschlianism. 1. *Luther.* Once Luther threw off the yoke of the Sovereign Pontiff, it was inevitable that Protestants should take free fling at the Divinity of Christ. Such free fling was at first stayed in its license by the masterful personality of Luther, Calvin, or some other heresiarch of the sixteenth century. An infallible Luther or an infallible Calvin was assumed in the stead of an infallible Pope; and in this wise, though much of the deposit of faith was given up, at least the Divinity of Christ was for a while assured to Protestants.

2. *Lutheran Scholasticism.* During the seventeenth century, there still remained the authority of the infallible Book; and, by that authority, Lutheran theologians strove to defend and explain the union of the two natures of Christ in one Divine Person. They reverted to that scholastic theology which Luther had so decried. A Catholic reaction set in. This was the period of Lutheran scholasticism. The theories and vagaries of the Lutheran scholastics were an intellectualistic departure from Luther's voluntaristic theology; and made plane the ways awayward from Christ.

3. *Kant.* The revolt against this array of scholasticism on the side of Luther took place in the eighteenth century. The pioneer rebel was Immanuel Kant (1724-1804). He was an anti-intellectualist. According to him, pure reason cannot attain to the knowledge of either the human or the Divine nature in Jesus. Hence faith is not an act of pure reason on the authority of God revealing. Faith is an act of the will or the practical reason. The practical reason postulates, by a Kantian *Ought*, the acceptance of the Man-God; and this acceptance by the will is the Kantian act of faith in Christ.

Such an act of faith in the Divinity of Christ was Luther's own. Kant harked back to Luther; and built up a philosophy that might serve as a foundation to Protestantism. What the philosophy of Aristotle is to Catholic theology, that the philosophy of Kant is to the Protestantism of Luther.

This relation of Kant to Luther has been sympathetically analyzed by Dr. George W. Richards, Professor of Church History in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States:

Luther and Kant were irrationalists in their conception of the relation between faith and reason. Luther found revelation the only source of religious truth and faith the organ of its appropriation. Faith in God is not based on logical demonstration or historical research, but *on the immediate apprehension of the heart*. With the heart believeth man unto righteousness. This corresponds to Kant's anti-intellectualism, denying that the pure reason can attain a knowledge of God and His kingdom, but finding access to the realm of divine thought through the will or the practical reason. The reformer and the philosopher *find the way to God, not through the intellect but through the will*.¹

That last sentence is worth noting. Kant finds "the way to God, not through the intellect but through the will." When Kant defines religion to be "the recognition of all our duties as if they were divine commandments,"² he does not mean that *pure reason* recognizes these duties; for then the intellect would find "the way to God". Kant means that the categorical imperative of the *practical reason* imposes such "duties as if they were divine commandments". And so Kantian Christology is not a creed, that the intellect accepts on the authority of God revealing. For God cannot reveal His thought to man. As Dr. Richards says, according to Kant,

a final and finished system of doctrine and morals can neither be immediately revealed to man nor directly discovered by man. Such revelation or discovery would contradict the laws of his psychic nature. *Only by human experience*, by gradual conformity to the mind and will of God, *can man come to a knowledge of God's*

¹ "The Kantian Philosophy and Christian Theology," *Constructive Quarterly*, June, 1916, p. 358.

² *Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*, chapter 4, p. 1.

thought and of God's will. Therefore our theology and our ethics are always relative and never absolute. . . . This involves progressive advance in knowledge and morals, and the necessity of constant reconstruction of theology and ethics.³

The "constant reconstruction of theology" has gone on apace among those Protestant scholars who "by human experience . . . come to a knowledge of God's thought". And so creeds have disappeared. Dogmas are filliped at with a sneer. This sneer is the result of Kant's philosophy and Luther's Christology.

The logical outcome of this view is a new apologetic. . . . The new apologetic must prove God by demanding moral life rather than by proving a religious dogma. The emphasis is shifted *from creeds to deeds*.⁴

That is one of the pet Modernistic phrases of the day: Christianity is *deeds, not creeds!* Modernism is a logical outgrowth from the philosophy of Kant. Set the "human experience" of Dr. Richards or the Kantian *Ought* as the ultimate criterion of Christological truth, and you get a Christology as variable as is *unknown x* of algebra. We can never reach the truth in regard to Christ; for truth is *always becoming*: it never *is*! Such is Dr. Richards' opinion: "Truth is not static but genetic. We are in the progress of attaining it; the goal is not in a past age but in a future æon."⁵

4. *Ritschl*. At the outset of his career as a Biblical scholar, 1846, Albrecht Benjamin Ritschl was, for a year, an enthusiastic follower of the Neo-Tübingen school of Christology. Tübingen was then the chief stronghold of the defenders of the "historical Christ". Here Ferdinand Christian Bauer carried on his search and research for a "Christ of history". Soon Ritschl rather wearied of the unconscionable arbitrariness of Bauer in "the historical criticism" of the Biblical text. It was not very scientific research work merely to throw over the supernatural, to deny the possibility of miracles and of revelation; and then to recast the Gospels to suit this so-called

³ *Constructive Quarterly*, June, 1916, p. 360.

⁴ Richards, l. c., p. 359.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 361.

critical view. Ritschl no longer was thrilled to see the Gospel of Mark as Bauer would have written it, had Bauer been Mark. The supernatural portions were carved out, dubbed *Pauline*, and assumed to have been trumped up with a dogmatic purpose; a few disjointed verses were picked out as genuine, dubbed *Petrine*, and made the sources of a critical research for a "Christ of history".

Ten years later, 1856, as associate professor of New Testament theology, at the University of Bonn, Ritschl openly showed his disgust for the divisive criticism of Bauer; rejected his own theory of the dependence of Luke on the apocryphal gospel of Marcion;⁶ and gave over all effort to reconstruct the text of the Gospels.

From this time and on, it matters not to Ritschl whether there was or was not a gradual evolution of the original gospel from a simple Petrine narrative unto a fully fledged Pauline theology. It matters not whether there ever was or was not a Person called Jesus. What matters to Ritschl? The Christ-value matters! The value of the Lord to the Christian conscience is the one great thing in Christianity! What the Gospels mean to us is not Jesus *in himself*, but Jesus *in his value* to the conscience of the Christian community!

II. Ritschl's Value-Judgments, Werturtheilen. 1. *Arising from the Kantian Ought.* In the Christology of Ritschl, so far as it logically follows from an epistemological theory of knowledge, the value-judgment is a very fundamental principle. Realizing the need of a philosophical foundation for his system of Christology, Ritschl made more and more of these value-judgments as the years went on. During the latter years of his leadership, in his *Theologie und Metaphysik*,⁷ he falls back on Kant's theory of knowledge. Since pure reason is incapable of attaining to the *thing-in-itself*, Christ *in himself* does not matter. What matters is the categoric imperative of practical reason; and this categoric imperative dictates the *Christ-value* to the Christian conscience. Hence Ritschl "held that religious knowledge finds expression in *independent* or

⁶ *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lukas*; Tübingen, 1846.

⁷ Bonn, 1881.

direct value-judgments" ⁸—in judgments that are *independent* of scientific knowledge, and the *direct* dictate of practical reason.

2. *Influenced by Lotze.* The same work, *Theologie und Metaphysik*, shows that the matured theology of Ritschl was influenced by the epistemology of Lotze. Rudolf Hermann Lotze (1817-1881) defended a theory of knowledge that he called *teleological idealism*. He rejected the Absolute of Hegel; and made his start from ethics. In this start, he was voluntaristic, rather than intellectualistic; and so appealed to Ritschl. Lotze admitted and yet denied the pluralism of the universe. Individual things are the *monads* of Leibnitz. These *monads* are interrelated by an all-inclusive unity in the Absolute of Spinoza. The interrelation of *monads*, as cause and effect, is a mechanism without any objective validity that pure reason reaches; on the contrary, the validity of each causal series is a mere realization of a teleological series of moral ideas. In brief, the series of *noumena*, "things-in-themselves", has no objective validity other than that due to a series of Kantian *Oughts*.

In this philosophy of Lotze, the unity of the individual is merged into the unity of the Absolute. And in keeping with the same philosophy, Ritschl substitutes the unity of the Christian community for the unity of self. This phase of Ritschlianism has been well worked out by the Rev. Edgar S. Brightman, of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut.⁹ By citations from *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*,¹⁰ Brightman shows that Ritschl makes "the sole criterion of a religious truth" to be "the fact that it is believed or experienced by the Christian community". The subjective experiences of a few are no such criterion. The few are not a social unity; they fail to realize the teleological series of moral ideas, that Lotze postulates for validity of cause and effect. The witness of the Spirit is not in the subjective experience of the few; but in the "social consciousness of the community".¹¹

⁸ *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*; New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1911; vol. 10, p. 44, art, "Ritschl," by O. Ritschl.

⁹ "Ritschl's Criterion of religious Truth," *American Journal of Theology*, April, 1917, pp. 212 ff.

¹⁰ 3d German edition, vol. 3, chapters 1-4.

¹¹ Loc. cit., p. 215.

This substitution of the "social consciousness of the community" for the subjective experiences of a few, as the ultimate criterion of religious truth, does not change the Ritschlian theory of "direct and independent value-judgments". For each individual must, by his own "direct and independent value-judgment", accept the object of faith of the Christian community; that is to say, each individual, independently of all scientific investigation, and solely by the dictate of the practical reason, merely because of a Kantian *Ought*, must accept the Christ-value that the community accepts. The fact that the community accepts this Christ-value can not be a motive of credibility in the Ritschlian system. For, in the Ritschlian system, there are no motives of credibility. Motives of credibility belong to the range of scientific judgments. And the value-judgment, which constitutes the Ritschlian act of faith, is a *direct* judgment of the practical reason and entirely *independent* of the speculations of pure and scientific reasoning.

It is interesting to note, by the bye, that Lotze's teleological series of moral ideas, as taken over by Ritschl to mean the "social consciousness of the community", is the parent of the voluntaristic, idealistic, socialistic, deified, Christ-form of Josiah Royce of Harvard—The Beloved Community.¹²

3. *Fundamental to Ritschlianism.* This theory of "direct and independent value-judgments" is sometimes overlooked or denied its importance by admirers of Ritschl; and should therefore be established as fundamental to Ritschlianism. We find it in the great work that Ritschl wrote on *Justification and Reconciliation*, twenty-one years before his studies in Kant and Lotze.¹³ The statement is clear: "Religious knowledge in general, and therefore Christian knowledge, too, consists of value-judgments."¹⁴

4. *Independent of Scientific Judgments.* These value-judgments, whereby we accept the Christ-value to us, are

¹² Cf., "Dr. Royce and the Beloved Community," *ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW*, November, 1916, pp. 573 ff.

¹³ *Die christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, 3 vols.; Bonn, 1870-74.

¹⁴ *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, vol. 3, "The positive development of the doctrine," translated from the 3d German ed. by Mackintosh and Macaulay, 2d ed., Edinburg: T. & T. Clark 1902, p. 204.

entirely *independent* of scientific knowledge. We are conscious, by the Kantian categoric imperative of practical reason, that immortal joy is assured us; we *directly* postulate the teleological series of moral ideas of Lotze, and the consequent harmony of the causal series of Christ-values with God's purpose in creating us for immortal joy; and, *presto*, we appropriate by the will these Christ-values. This act of appropriation, by an act of faith, or *trust*, of the *will*, is what Ritschl means by religious knowledge. The independence of religious knowledge from scientific, he thus states:

In Christianity, religious knowledge consists in *independent* value-judgments, inasmuch as it deals with the relation between the blessedness which is assured by God and sought by man, and the whole of the world which God has created and rules in harmony with his final end.¹⁵

5. *Independent of Pure Reason's Value-Judgments.* Ritschl further differentiates these "direct and independent value-judgments" from *concomitant* value-judgments of pure reason. In the matter of religious knowledge, he postulates only the Kantian "direct and independent" *Ought*. Connected with scientific knowledge, there may be *concomitant* value-judgments. One may scientifically and indirectly attain to the Christ-value. These scientific value-judgments are dependent upon pure reason, and are not the direct dictate of practical reason. Hence such *concomitant*, scientific value-judgments are not religious knowledge at all. They do not enter into "the relation between the blessedness which is assured by God and sought by man, and the whole of the world which God has created and rules in harmony with his final end". That teleological series of moral ideas, containing the relations between man's immortality and God's purpose in creation, is not reached by scientific pure reason, but postulated by "direct and independent value-judgments". Here is Ritschl's distinction between non-religious, scientific, *concomitant* value-judgments and the *independent* value-judgments that constitute religious knowledge:

¹⁵ Op. cit., p. 207.

The former are operative and necessary in all theoretical cognition, as in all technical observation and combination. But all perceptions of *moral ends* or moral hindrances are *independent* value-judgments, in so far as they excite moral pleasure or pain, or, it may be, *set in motion the will to appropriate what is good* or repel the opposite. . . . Religious knowledge forms another class of *independent* value-judgment.¹⁶

III. Some Neo-Ritschlians. 1. *Widgery*. In the light of these "direct and independent value-judgments", must we take the attitude of the Neo-Ritschlian to the Christ-fact. Dr. Allan G. Widgery, Presbyterian, of the University of St. Andrews, is a true Ritschlian when he deprecates the fact that for nearly two thousand years the theologians of the Church have occupied themselves with the historicity of the physical Resurrection of Jesus. He thinks, it is not the fact of the physical Resurrection of Christ that is important, but the value of the idea of Resurrection. Hence a man may be an agnostic, or may deny the Resurrection outright, and yet may, by a Kantian *Ought*, appropriate all that the idea of the Resurrection means. For this very idea has the religious value of proving that they err who deny life after death.

To Dr. Widgery we reply that one must exclude all religious knowledge from the realm of scientific truth, and follow a blind dictate of practical reason, in order to accept such vaporings as these:

Not belief in the physical resurrection of Jesus but the idea of resurrection in the fullest and widest application is the source of moral energy and religious hope. Though a man declare himself agnostic with regard to the former, or *even if he reject it outright*, all that the latter implies is still open to his faith.¹⁷

2. *R. A. C. Macmillan*. This divorce of scientific from religious knowledge, and limitation of religion to value-judgments that are independent of scientific truth, leaves Christianity without a creed. Creedless Christianity is exactly what the Rev. R. A. C. Macmillan, a Presbyterian, proposes "in behalf of what we may be obliged to regard as a *pathological*

¹⁶ Op. cit., p. 205.

¹⁷ "The Idea of the Resurrection," *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1915, p. 154.

religious consciousness". Some men have got themselves into such a neuropathic state of soul, that the very thought of the supernatural is offensive to them. Macmillan thinks that this oversensitiveness is due to "excessive culture". He would save the Christianity, without offending the sensibilities of

the intelligence which has become so sensitive and *overrefined by excessive culture* that it has lost the power of assimilating historical facts which are more than capable of exhausting the significance of all elemental knowledge of the divine nature.

It is better that such a neurotic Christian omit the reading of the Gospel. For he is pathologically disturbed by the first mention of a miracle; "and, before he has reached the middle of his reading, the whole setting of the gospel loses probability". Let him remain a Christian, and form such "direct and independent value-judgments" of Christ as he may. To that end, let him read the Psalms and Isaias rather than the Gospels. In those Old Testament books, "he finds Elemental Religion perfectly expressed without any doctrinal expressions to offend his sensitive mind".¹⁸

3. *Armitage*. Not so ridiculous, yet equally wrong is the standpoint of Professor E. Armitage. Writing on "The Incompetence of the Mere Scholar to interpret Christianity",¹⁹ in true Ritschlian fashion, he holds that the acceptance of Christianity is not led up to by scientifically certain motives of credibility. To be a Christian is *an act of daring*. Even though "the aim of New Testament scholarship had been fully realized", and the historicity of the Gospels had been fully established, we should be no nearer to the goal of Christianity. "All would still be left to do." The unspiritual would not accept Jesus; only the spiritual would. To accept Jesus, one must be so spiritual as to follow the categoric imperative, the Kantian *Ought*, no matter what the obstacle in the way. The professor writes:

It is not permissible for us to shrink. Faith must have the courage of its convictions. . . . The act of faith must ever be a

¹⁸ Cf., "Religion without a Creed," *Expositor*, September, 1916, especially p. 194.

¹⁹ *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1916, p. 353 ff.

venture of the soul. The man who will be a Christian must ever come forth at the call of Christ from all earthly securities, and *dare* to follow.

It seems quite foolhardy to ask a Muhammedan "to come forth at the call of Christ from all earthly securities, and *dare* to follow", unless he is first certain that Christ and not Muhammed has the right to call. Yet such a *venture* is the Ritschlian act of faith, the will to accept Christ, because of a categoric imperative of the practical judgment in regard to the Christ-value—a judgment that is entirely independent of all scientific research and motives of credibility.

4. *Brightman*. Another Presbyterian minister, the Rev. Edgar S. Brightman, of Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut, shows the hold that Ritschlianism has upon the Presbytery in the United States.²⁰ Accepting "Ritschl's Criterion of religious truth",²¹ he denies to theology all scientific character:

When theology becomes scientific, as in the Eastern Church, it is not Christian but a secularisation of Christianity. *True Christian theology is not essentially scientific*; it is essentially religious. A Christian theologian must genuinely belong to the Christian community, and must start from the presupposition of the truth of the community-faith in Jesus.²²

A frank statement of the case! Since the Protestant act of faith is not reason's acceptance of a truth on the authority of God revealing, but an emotional confidence in salvation through Jesus, "true Christian theology is not essentially scientific; it is essentially religious", i. e. entirely independent of scientific reasoning. Hence there is no need that the Protestant minister be graduated from a university; he may be graduated from the base-ball diamond or the potato-patch. Only one thing matters. Does "he genuinely belong to the Christian community"? Has he joined the Church? Has he accepted Jesus? Then there is no need that he go through

²⁰ In the same connexion, cf. "The Christ of Union Theological Seminary," *ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW*, Sept., 1916, pp. 318 ff.

²¹ *American Journal of Theology*, April, 1917, pp. 212 ff.

²² *Loc. cit.*, p. 215.

a course in systematic theology. He may enter the pulpit at once and be a true theologian, so long as he make his "start from the presupposition of the truth of the community-faith in Jesus".

5. *Other Ritschlians.* In preceding Christological studies, we have detailed the attitude toward the Christ of other Neo-Ritschlians, such as the University of Chicago group, Ernest Dewitt Burton and Shailer Matthews;²³ Adolph Harnack,²⁴ R. Roberts,²⁵ H. Weinel,²⁶ Principal Fairbairn,²⁷ and Professor Wobbermin.²⁸

WALTER DRUM, S.J.

Woodstock College, Maryland.

²³ "Christological Errors," ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, December, 1914, pp. 740 ff.

²⁴ Ibid., pp. 743 ff.

²⁵ "Jesus or Christ," ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, February, 1915, pp. 220 ff.

²⁶ "A Christological Symposium," ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, March, 1915, pp. 367 ff.

²⁷ "Another Congregational Christology," ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, April, 1915, pp. 488 ff.

²⁸ "Dr. Lake's Eschatology," ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, June, 1916, p. 728.

Criticisms and Notes.

A MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF DOGMAS. Vol. I : The Development of Dogmas during the Patristic Age, 100-869. By the Rev. Bernard J. Otten, S.J., Professor of Dogmatic Theology in St. Louis University. B. Herder, St. Louis and London. 1917. Pp. 523.

Slowly but surely the conviction that the study of Dogma should go hand in hand with the study of History is gaining a practical response. Of course the interrelation of the two departments of knowledge was always recognized, the connexion being too obvious to escape the notice of even the most superficial observer. Nevertheless their vital relationship has only recently reached actual realization through investigation into the origin and growth of religious truths. Most readers of these pages can remember that they pursued the study of Dogmatic Theology with only a very slight reference to the historic processes that shaped the subject matter. Dogmas were statements of divinely revealed truth proposed by the *Magisterium Ecclesiae* for belief. The fact that they were revealed had to be established by passages from the Bible, and Tradition. But how the entire *depositum fidei* and how its several portions sprang up, how they grew into organic structure, how they developed in the Christian consciousness with fullness and clarity—of these intimately vital questions little or nothing was said. Hence the tendency to regard Dogmatic Theology as a merely deductive discipline, a system of abstract theses with their apparatus of proofs and corollaries. How it came to pass that the study has assumed or is assuming a more human vitality would be an interesting topic of discourse, but one foreign to the present place and purpose, as would also be the question whether treatises on the History of Dogma like the one above are to be considered as causes or as effects, of the genetic method.

Students of the subject are already acquainted with the English translation of Father Tixeront's *History of Dogma*. The work, it may not be superfluous to say, is a mine of erudition. The three volumes, however, are, as Father Otten remarks, "too voluminous to serve as a handbook," and besides they cover only the Patristic period. Since the volume before us comprises the same period, it may be presumed that its successor will carry the subject down to modern times. It will thus be noted that Tixeront's work is not superseded, but that the two works taken together are mutually supplementary. The French author is more copious in what concerns matters of the Patristic age, the American has in view the medieval and the modern periods. Though entitled a *Manual*, the present work deals with its subjects amply enough to hold the reader's living interest. It is not

a compendium or synopsis or a digest, but a sufficiently developed and a lucidly expressed survey of the gradual unfolding of the content of Revelation.

MORAL SERIES (CATHOLIC LIBRARY). By Roderick MacEachen, Priest of Columbus Diocese. Vol. I: Principles, Laws, Virtues, Sin. Pp. 180. Vol. II: Precepts, First Commandment. Pp. 198. Vol. III: Commandments of God. Pp. 212. Vol. IV: Justice and Rights. Pp. 189. Vol. V: Precepts of the Church, Special Questions, Index to the five volumes. Pp. 208. Catholic Book Co., Wheeling, West Virginia. 1916.

We have here the second half of the "Catholic Library" series. It should not be confounded, by the way, with another current series of the same general title, "The Catholic Library", whose scope differs somewhat from the present publication. The first half, "Catholic Dogma", was previously described in this REVIEW. The present five small volumes cover in a summary way the entire field of Catholic morality: principles, laws, virtues, sins, and the rest. Those who know Father Cathrein's *Katholische Moral* have often felt and expressed the wish that that solid and comprehensive exposition of Christian Ethics were rendered into English. Failing this *desiderandum*, the present summary goes far to supply the demand. Though not so philosophical as the German manual, the present exposition is a plain, clearly expressed compendium of Catholic doctrine concerning the principal elements of morality. The volumes are handy and neatly made and should be an appreciated addition to the Catholic layman's library and one all the more serviceable seeing that the series is perfectly indexed. The fifth volume touches upon certain special topics cognate to the general subject matter; for instance, prohibited books, cremation, secret societies and others. Perhaps a little more accuracy in handling these delicate themes were desirable. For instance, at page 61 we read: "Some books are forbidden only when not approved by ecclesiastical authority. Such are writings that relate new apparitions, prophecies and miracles. *Other books on religion also belong to this class.*" The latter sentence, which we have emphasized, seems rather vague in connexion with a subject regarding which precision is everything. The same observation might be extended to the statement that Masonic "oaths are sometimes confirmed by the most appalling imprecation" (p. 94), and that Masons "are satisfied with a certain show of natural external morality" (p. 97). The recollection of Leo Taxil's faking frauds are fresh enough to make us extremely cautious in writing about Masonry.

THE CENTENARY OF THE SOCIETY OF MARY. Prologue—The Centenary : A Retrospect and a Prospect. Historical Sketch : The Rev. William Joseph Chaminade, Founder of the Society of Mary. Historical Sketch : The Brothers of Mary in the United States. By Brother John E. Garvin, S. M. Seventy illustrations. Brothers of Mary, Mt. St. John, Dayton, Ohio, or Chaminade College, Clayton, Missouri. 1917. Pp. 284.

On the second of the present month the Society of Mary commemorates the hundredth anniversary of its foundation. If nothing came of the event save this memorial volume it would have been adequately fruitful of good. Obviously the occasion will be fraught with other results, all the more important because intangible and spiritual. To the members of the Institute and to the uncounted numbers both of the clergy and the laity who owe to the Brothers of Mary the uncovenanted blessings of a sound education the occasion must be one of joy and gratitude. But the palpable consequence of the centenary is the present publication, which, moreover, possesses an interest not simply for those who in some manner, whether immediately or mediately, are related to the Society, but for all who value the influence of lives of heroism and holiness.

The volume contains in the first place a sketch of the Founder of the Institute, and in the second place character portraits of those noble types of men who established the Brotherhood in the United States.

Father Chaminade was one of those intrepid priests of whom France has always been prolific. Braving the dangers of the Reign of Terror, disguised as a laboring man, he secretly administered the rites of religion to the Bourdaleses during the years of the Revolution. Having been detected and arrested, he was exiled to Spain. There at Saragossa he planned the works of many-sided beneficence which he afterward inaugurated at Bourdeaux, and which subsequently spread widely in various countries. All these works of charity and mercy grew out of the Sodality established by him in the latter city, and through them he became to France of the nineteenth century what St. Vincent de Paul was to France of the seventeenth century.

The principal outcome of the Sodality was the Society of Mary, which Father Chaminade established in 1817 and to which Catholic education owes so great a debt not only in Europe and the Far East, but notably in the United States. The Society came to America in 1849 and rapidly spread to Dayton, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, Rochester, San Antonio, and other centres. In this country and the Hawai-

ian Islands the Institute counts at present about four hundred and twenty members, serving in sixty establishments. The latter comprise six colleges, five high schools, and forty-nine parish schools, with a total enrollment of about eighteen thousand pupils. If compared with the rapid growth of the communities of religious women, these statistics do not appear in any way remarkable, but it must not be forgotten that the cloister and the school room appeal more naturally to women than to men. Indeed it might almost seem like a fifth mark of the Church that she is able to draw *men* to enter religious associations organized to labor in school rooms and under the severe and naturally unattractive regimen of the Catholic Brotherhoods. A man's nature does not of itself urge him to embrace the life of these Brotherhoods. Nevertheless, given a sound nature and a robust character, grace can do wonders in developing such types of Christian virility as shone forth in the lives of Brothers like Andrew, Maximin, John, Damian, Charles, who established the Society of Mary in the Middle West; to say nothing of their countless successors whose deeds of selfless devotedness are recorded not in story but in the virtuous lives of their uncounted pupils. By rescuing from oblivion the memory of Father Chaminade, Brother Garvin has preserved for the clergy an inspiring example of a noble priest, and by sketching the lives of the Founders of the Society in the United States he has presented to his own associates and to all who can admire manly virtue models of whole-hearted devotedness to the cause of Christian education.

THE LIFE OF MOTHER PAULINE VON MALLINCKRODT. Foundress of the Sisters of Christian Charity, Daughters of the Blessed Virgin Mary of the Immaculate Conception. With an Introduction by the Most Rev. George W. Mundelein, D. D., Archbishop of Chicago. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917.

Another addition to the recently growing number of biographies of the foundresses of the Congregations of religious women. It would be an interesting and doubtless a spiritually profitable study to draw forth from these biographies the traits of character common to these holy religious and to note the differences in their personalities. Unity in variety would be found to prevail here as in every other department of creation, and not only as the constituents of beauty but as the ground of material and spiritual efficiency. The multiplication of these life stories is supplying the materials for an inductive quest of the law in the present case, and probably some one will analyze and utilize the data for a new apologetic argument,

possessing, to say the least, a high degree of probability and persuasiveness.

Pauline von Mallinckrodt, like most women of her vocation, owed to a mother in whom gentleness and firmness, a well-balanced personality, and a refined education harmoniously blended, the foundations of a unified and fruitful career. Her father, though a sound and sensible man, lived and died a Protestant. He left, however, at his death four children, all of whom inherited the intelligent and religious dispositions of their mother. Pauline, the eldest daughter, became the foundress of the Sisters of Christian Charity, and Herman, the elder son, the great organizer and leader of the Catholic (Centre) party in Germany and the intrepid and successful champion of Catholic rights in the Reichstag. Pauline was born in Minden, 3 June, 1817, and died in Paderborn, 30 April, 1881. She established her congregation, 21 August, 1849, first for the care of blind children, and then for the general work of education, although no undertaking of corporal or spiritual mercy was to be alien to its purpose. Little did she think when she and her three companions received the habit at the hands of Bishop Drepper of Paderborn that the nucleus of her religious family was to multiply as it has done in Europe and in the two Americas. The more so that the institution was to bear the full brunt of the iniquitous Falk Laws and the anti-religious persecution which for a time threatened the congregation's very existence. However, here as usually the storms only fastened more firmly the roots, and at present the Sisterhood counts twenty-two foundations in Germany, one in Switzerland, three in Bohemia, and three in Denmark.

The Sisters came to the United States in 1873 and they have with us at present fifty-five foundations. In 1874 they opened a school in Chile, and now they number thirty-one institutions in South America. Such has been the growth of the mustard seed within less than three-score years. The secret of it lies, of course, in the Providence of God. How that Providence shaped and directed the chief instrument, Pauline von Mallinckrodt, is narrated in the present biography. The story is simply and devoutly told, and should be an inspiration and an encouragement to the spiritual daughters of Mother Pauline. The influence, however, of Mother Pauline's heroic life cannot be confined to the convent walls. The laity in general, reading these pages, will behold the power of high ideals and whole-hearted devotedness, and should be stimulated to yield themselves to these forces which are always waiting and knocking for entrance into human lives. Perhaps, too, Catholic maidens may derive from the same source the impulse to tread in the footsteps of a woman so brave and yet so gentle as Pauline of Mallinckrodt.

AN INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY. By H. P. Farrell, M. A., formerly Principal and Professor of History, Dagram Jethmal Sind College, Karachi. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1917. Pp. 220.

Since political science has been divorced alike from Moral Philosophy and from General Sociology it has grown both extensively and intensively to such a degree that professors of it have felt the urgency, if not the necessity, to write treatises introductory to it. Sometimes the latter class of works would seem to be so named in virtue of the modesty of their authors. For as a fact they not only introduce the student but carry him well into and through the theory of the state and of government. Witness, for instance, the *Introduction* (American Book Co., New York), by Professor James Wilfrid Garner. The volume, with its six hundred pages, deals quite fully with the whole domain of political theory. The same is true of Professor Gettell's *Introduction*. The author of the volume at hand is apparently unaware of the existence of these, on the whole, excellent works by the two American writers.

Be this as it may, he has treated his subject from a viewpoint quite different from that of the authors just mentioned. The latter, though entitling their respective works "science", might with greater precision have ranked them as "philosophy", since both consider the State fundamentally and universally. Dr. Farrell's book, on the other hand, might with equal propriety be called an Introduction to Political *Philosophers*; for his treatment is in reality an exposition, with critical observations, of the opinions of such leading writers on the State as Plato and Aristotle; Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau; the English Jurists, especially Blackstone; and the Historical School, Montesquieu, Auguste Comte, and Sir Harvy Maine. Inasmuch, therefore, as the volume introduces the student to these more or less influential thinkers, and helps him to estimate their teachings, it is serviceable particularly in relation to the author's purpose, which is to furnish university students, especially in England and India, with the elementary knowledge required to enter intelligently into political philosophy as preparatory to the honor's examination in history. This purpose is facilitated, moreover, by the clarity and conciseness of the treatment.

The author mentions some of St. Thomas's political teachings found in the *De Regimine Principum*, and some of Suarez's doctrine, from the *De Legibus*. The reference, however, in both cases shows that he is but slightly acquainted personally, if at all, with either text. No one who had really examined the *De Legibus* would venture to write that "the resemblance of Suarez's ideas to those of the

'judicious Hooker' has been often noticed" (p. 203) — *sic parvis magna componere solebat*—any more than would one familiar with the relations between State and Church in the Middle Ages assert that "the Empire had been crushed into powerlessness by the Papacy" (p. 111). *Ne quid nimis!*

"BLESSED ART THOU AMONG WOMEN." The Life of the Virgin Mother. Illustrated by One Hundred and Fifty Masterpieces of the World's Greatest Painters. With Inspired Writings telling the Story of His Coming, His Birth and Childhood, His Victory over Satan in the Wilderness. Compiled by William Frederick Butler. Foreword by the Most Rev. John Ireland, D.D., Archbishop of St. Paul. Rand, McNally & Co., Chicago. 1916. Pp. xxxiii—315.

It were a platitudinous excess to say that this is a work worthy of its theme. It will be nearer to the sober truth to say that the bookmaker's skill has here given of its best products to form a fitting frame for the worthiest tributes of the finest arts of pen and pencil to the worthiest of creatures. Sumptuous paper and a perfect letterpress make up the material encasement for the fairest gems of literature and the classic creations of painting. The text consists of three parts, and each is made up of selections from the treasuries of letters. The first part contains the prophecies relating to the coming of the Messiah, and draws the narrative from Isaias, from the Sibylline Oracles, from Virgil's mysteriously prophetic Eclogue; from Pope's *Messiah*. The second part tells of the fulfillment of the Messianic prophecies, and hence of necessity draws its material from the Gospels—St. Matthew and St. Luke. The third part completes the story by telling of the consequences to man of the advent of the Son of God and the triumph of the Son of Man over Satan. Milton's *Paradise Regained* offers for this a fitting expression. So much for the literary contents of the book. The decorative elements are selected from the most famous masterpieces of painting and are reproduced in full page (sepia) illustrations. Of these there are 165 in number, representing sixty-five of the world's greatest painters. The volume therefore contains a collection of the classical pictures relating to the Madonna and her Child.

The reader will see from the foregoing description that the book is intended to be and is essentially a work of art dedicated to her who is "blessed among women." As such its proper place is in the Catholic home, where it should exert a refining as well as an instructive and edifying influence. It may therefore be expected to

replace some of the tawdry specimens of the life of the Mother and the Child which have hitherto been anything but an ornament to the parlor table.

Where both author and publisher have done so much to give us a thing of beauty, it may seem ungracious to make even a suggestion looking to any other format. Still *de gustibus*, etc. There are very many people to whose taste a simpler style of binding and paper would more appeal. Say, durable half morocco binding, plain unadorned cover—at most the title or monogram in the centre; unglazed paper for the text and illustrations; each of the latter could have a distinct leaf to itself. These changes would increase somewhat the cost of the book; but this would be balanced by the increased number of purchasers who would be willing to pay the increased price to obtain an object of art appealing to their own taste and that of the friends to whom they might desire to send it as a present.

THE EBB AND FLOW OF LIFE. New Stories for Old and Young, in four volumes. By Conrad Kümmel. Translated from the third and fourth German editions, with the permission of the author, by a Father of St. Bede Abbey, Peru, Illinois. 1917. Pp. 452, 448, 435, and 415.

Conrad Kümmel is one of modern Germany's most charming and therefore popular story-writers. Born in Rechberg (Württemberg) in 1848, ordained priest in 1873, named Domestic Prelate in 1900, his life has been largely devoted to letters. Editor of various Catholic magazines, he has labored to propagate Christian truth and virtue through the medium of tale and story. He has published several series of these popular stories, amongst them *Des Lebens Flut* (Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau; 1912). It is this collection which has been rendered into English by a Benedictine priest of St. Bede's and is given us in the present four volumes.

There are thirty-eight stories. While they are meant by the translator to supply the growing demand for "the short story", they may not all be grouped under the latter caption, in the sense in which the term is employed by our popular "red books". For instance, the first volume contains seven stories, one of which runs to eighty, and two others beyond a hundred pages. Perhaps the stories would have better served the purpose of amusing as well as educating, if the translator had taken the liberty of condensing them. The descriptive details and the conversations become occasionally what the Germans call *ein Bischen langweilig*, or, as the smart Yankee boy would put it, "slow". No doubt such expansiveness suits the more meditative Würtembergians, but they appeal less to the step-lively

American. This is, however, perhaps a matter upon which taste may enjoy its liberty of differing. But when the liberty has been fully indulged, all will most likely admit that the stories are wholesome, interesting, and in many respects pleasing, as well as instructive and edifying. If the clever boy or the pert maiden take not gleefully to the reading of them, the more earnest and sensible youth and their mature elders no doubt will. We like to think that somewhere in Catholic homes the children and the parents still gather round the family lamp of winter evenings to listen to the reading of a good book. Stories like these have their place in such circles, and for this as well as other reasons they should find room in the parish and the school libraries.

A YEAR OF COSTA RICAN NATURAL HISTORY. By Amelia Smith Olvert, Sometime Fellow in Biology, Bryn Mawr College, and Philip Powell Olvert, Professor of Zoology, University of Pennsylvania, Editor of "Entomological News;" with Maps and Illustrations. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1917. Pp. 596.

Obviously a work of this kind does not fall within the immediate scope of an ecclesiastical review. The priest's reading as such is preoccupied with subjects of another order. Nevertheless, there will probably be not a few under whose notice the above title may fall who, whether by reason of the natural or the local or national features which it suggests, would like to know something concerning the contents of the volume. Indeed it were greatly to be desired that natural history itself entered more generally into the lines of clerical studies. It goes without saying that no books, outside the Bible and its related literature, together with those that deal with man and his history, are, if well written, at once so absorbingly interesting and so helpful in the priestly ministry as those that describe the living things of the ground and the air. It was to these that the Author of Nature Himself appealed in proof of His Father's Providence, and the priest can do few things more elevating and instructive than to consider the flowers of the field and the winged things of the air. The objects of such study lie close to his hand and his eye, and the books that introduce him to their wonderful and spiritually suggestive structure and habits are countless and almost ubiquitous. Just one out of the ten thousand is the present record of the experiences of two naturalists in Costa Rica.

Although four hundred years have passed since Columbus sailed along the shores of Costa Rica, "the land of the rich coast" has never ceased yielding up its exhaustless wealth, whether to the aborigines, to the conquistadores and their Spanish successors, or to the

pale-faces from the North. And well can she afford to be generous with her gifts, for upon few spots of our planet has nature been so lavish as upon this land of plenty. Every variety of climate is here, from the torrid heats of the low-lying valleys and the marshes by the Atlantic to the salubrious plains upon which rest such splendid cities as San José, and upward to the frigid summits of the Cordilleras whose topmost peaks pierce the clouds twelve thousand feet beyond the level of the sea. From the heart of her mountains she gives to the world the precious ores, while her rivers sweep the golden dust down to the placer mines in the valleys. Her forests yield the most costly woods, ebony, mahogany and cedar, while her fields teem with rich grains and delicious fruits, the sugar-cane, coffee, rice, the pineapple, and the luscious banana. Of the latter fruit alone many million bunches annually leave her ports for the markets of the North. Even the air of Costa Rica is rich, rich not alone in the elements that sustain and restore man's health, but in the fairy forms that live and fly in its bosom. Bird life is represented by some seven hundred species, including the gorgeous parrot and the brilliant humming-bird. The busy mosquito and the ubiquitous *musca domestica* are not lacking, but the lambent air is bespangled with every variety of beauteous butterfly and the bright-winged dragon-fly darts through the vibrant sunshine.

It was these fair creatures of the air and the flown glades that led the naturalists whose names appear on the title-page of the volume above, to spend a year in study and research in this land of living riches. Some of their experiences and the record of their discoveries in the realm of nature, especially of birds and insects, are set down in much detail and vividly illustrated with manifold photographs and maps. Dragon-flies particularly engrossed their study, and of these strange and to some people rather forbidding creatures they have much to say. They were fortunate in discovering many rare and not a few entirely new varieties of these interesting neuroptera.

Not all their discoveries and experiences are narrated, much being reserved for a future and more specialized work. Most of the descriptions, both of animate nature and of localities, are highly interesting. The experiences were not of course uniformly delightful. It could hardly have been pleasant, for instance, to be in the midst of an earthquake which destroyed many lives and well nigh deleted Cartago.

Many interesting things are told of the social conditions and customs of the people. We make room here for a description in point. Early in December the authors spent three days at El Brazil. "The roads were then in good condition, as the rains were over, but the dry season was not old enough to produce much dust. The country

still looked fresh and green. . . . The great fiestas of the Immaculate Conception were celebrated during this visit. This is one of the chief fiestas of the year everywhere in Costa Rica, but particularly in the 'barrios' of Concepcion, of which there is one in nearly every 'district'. El Brazil was in the barrio of Concepcion de Alajuela and in the midst of celebrations by no means entirely religious in character. The chief day, December eighth, is a legal holiday. In Alajuela it was the custom to have bull fights; booths were erected around the plaza of the Church of Concepcion; the country people went to town for the day of the eighth (if not for all the days of the fiestas) dressed in their newest, gayest and cleanest, masqueraders sang and danced, and after dark there was a general dance on the grass to the music of as many bands as could be mustered. This year, owing to lack of funds, the bull fights and more elaborate celebrations were omitted—much to the delight of the employers of peon labor. During the fiestas no one will work, and it meant the loss of several days in the height of the coffee season, when every hour is precious, but this time only one day was lost. All morning we watched the people streaming past the gate of El Brazil toward Alajuela, the women radiant in stiffly-starched muslin dresses of pink or blue or white, with gay silk rebosas of rainbow colors, the men in less striking clothes but with brightly colored handkerchiefs knotted about their throats; nearly all were barefooted. Bombs and fire-crackers began to go off at 5 A. M. and continued all day. The coffee machinery stopped and the only workmen about were a few faithful peons who were induced to come at 4 A. M. to attend to some things without which much coffee would have spoiled. They were willing to work from four to six because no one would see them, but seemed to think they would lose caste if caught in the act" (p. 343). One is tempted to ask whether the latter was really the motive why these "few faithful peons" elected to work on "a holy day" only from four to six. Might it not have been because they could thus find an opportunity to do their religious duty of hearing Mass at a later hour, and thereafter lawfully enjoy the fiesta? Protestant naturalists sometimes misunderstand the Catholic peon.

Naturally, as the foregoing paragraph suggests, the religious customs of the people come up repeatedly for animadversion, and although the witnesses endeavor to be fair and just, they were seemingly incapable of rightly interpreting what they witnessed in these matters. It is probably impossible for a Northern Protestant to understand the religious observances of Catholic Spaniards, and consequently we must expect a certain display of superciliousness, some flippancy as well as sheer nescience, to use the politest term at our

disposal, when they touch upon such matters. In the present case the authors, although evidently expert entomologists, are no less manifestly deficient and naïve in matters of religion. Moreover, aside from intellectual or temperamental limitations, something no doubt must be allowed for the character of the authors' companions in their tours of exploration. These were not in each case, even when their associates were eminent in the science of "pottery excavated from the graves of the aborigines", types of Catholic life and virtue.

Aside, however, from a few passages touching upon the religious practices of the people, the volume is instructive and interesting, and a notable contribution to the natural history and topography of Costa Rica. Chatty in style, it possesses the attractiveness that usually accompanies narratives of personal experiences in distant lands. Its contents are unlocked by a good index, and supplemented by a copious bibliography.

Literary Chat.

The axiom "Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus" to the average non-Catholic mind is a terrible threat, a synthesis of ignorance and intolerance, a relic of a bygone age when they burned heretics and mercilessly damned whosoever wittingly or unwittingly believed otherwise than did the Romans. Moreover, not a few Catholics in our own day, though clinging to the Church, find no little disturbance when their non-Catholic brethren cite this dogma and would rather it were left to slumber peaceably in the dusty folios of theology.

Theologians as well as apologists have discussed the problem and have not reached a unanimous explanation. The distinction between the body and the soul of the Church is the one most generally appealed to. At any rate, an all-round discussion of the subject cannot fail of a welcome from those who seek not only for themselves peace in believing, but also clarity of interpretation for the benefit of non-Catholic inquirers. Such a discussion is provided by a small volume written in French by Father Bainvel, S. J., and translated into English by Father J. L. Weidenhan. The writer's reputation for clear thinking and lucid expression is sustained by the little opuscle and the translator has done justice to his text. (*Is there Salvation outside the Catholic Church?* B. Herder, St. Louis.)

Almanacs for 1918 are beginning to come in. One of the first to reach us is *St. Anthony's*, published by the Franciscan Fathers (Calicoon, New York; and Paterson, New Jersey). It contains the usual chronological information and almost a hundred well-packed pages of reading matter, the latter being edifying, instructive, and interesting. The Almanac is just what a wholesome household needs and should have.

The Pueblos are a strange race. There is an air of mystery and romance about them and their queer, quaint adobe box-houses. Who that has read the siege of Acoma as narrated by Charles Lummis in that charming book, *The Spanish Pioneers*, but would like to know something more about how the present descendants of those intrepid little warriors that put up such a hard fight with

the conquistadores, pass their time up there in their lofty mesa on the Arizonian desert? Father Schuster, O.F.M., who is working among the Pueblos, gives a sketch in the *Almanac*, just mentioned, of their history, and a picture of Acoma; but he merely whets one's appetite to know something of the present Acomans, and then leaves one hungry.

He does, however, say certain things about the Pueblos in general, which at least the mothers and the daughters in the homes up North where the *Almanac* makes its annual visit, will like to hear. There is no divorce at all in Pueblodom. Unlike the squaws of the noble red men of the North, the women are never slaves to their wedded lords. The men do all the outside work, the women the inside. The Pueblos are farmers and the man takes care of the crops while they are in the fields; but once the crops are harvested and garnered the woman has charge of them and none is sold or bartered without her consent. If the wife thinks she has serious grievance against her husband, she does not "spat," but she ties up his goods in a bundle and sets it outside before the door. When Popo comes home and sees the bundle, he stays without and looks for a boarding house where he may stay until he can bring his case before the governor and his jury, who will look into the matter and pass judgment.

So much for one half of the family. As for the other half, Pueblo children, we are told, "are always well behaved and need not the chastening rod." What a jolly state of things! Almost too good to be true, isn't it? But what is more, "the most beautiful virtues of the Pueblos are their respect for and obedience to not only their parents, but to all old people." This we have from a reliable *testis oculatus*. We wonder what would happen if we sent some of our city lads to school down in Acoma? Would they behave like the good little Pueblo boys? Would they convert or pervert the natives to their own sweet habits of independence? Or would they jump off the mesa?

It might seem that "The Carnegie Endowment Fund for International Peace" must have gone out of business, and that in the present state of universal war there would be nothing to do but to draw salaries and keep an eye out for the dawn of peace. To think this, however, would be a great mistake. In proof hereof we have the Secretary's declaration in the *Year Book* for 1917. We learn further from the same well-stored bureau of reports and statistics that the Trustees of the Fund at their annual meeting last April declared their belief that "the most effectual means of promoting enduring international peace is to prosecute the war against the imperial Government of Germany to final victory for democracy in accordance with the policy declared by the President of the United States." While some might be inclined to question this resolution, there will be none who will not applaud another passed at the same meeting, to wit the assigning of half a million of dollars to aid in the restoration of the devastated homes in France, Belgium, Serbia, and Russia. May it not be hoped that a like benevolence will be extended to the poor people of Lithuania, Poland and Armenia?

It should be noted that the purpose of the Fund is essentially educational. To this end a large number of publications are issued and distributed gratis to applicants. A full list of these pamphlets and books is given in the *Year Book* (Endowment Headquarters, Washington, D. C.).

The faculty of St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Allegany, New York, have inaugurated a publication which might well be imitated by other similar institutions, namely a *Year Book* which is to serve as a medium for publishing papers or short essays composed by the seminarians. The ulterior aim is to stimulate and encourage the students to write for print, so that afterward as priests they may be led to utilize the press as an agency for the spread of truth and the refutation of error. The new publication, moreover, will serve

as a bond of communication with the alumni of the Seminary, who are also invited to contribute to its pages. The initial number of the Year Book is a highly creditable production both as regards outward form and the character and general merit of its contents. (St. Bonaventure P. O., New York.)

From the earliest times the existence of evil in this world, otherwise so fair, has puzzled the minds of men. All kinds of solutions of the vexing problem have been ventured, running the gamut from Manichæan dualism to Mr. Brittling's finite and struggling deity. Job is the symbol of those who grapple with the terrible realities of evil and are crushed under its merciless weight, to rise, after harrowing agonies of mental struggle, to the serene heights of resignation and understanding. But the Biblical Job, with his simple, unshakable trust in God's justice, no longer appeals to the sophisticated mind of to-day. So Étienne Giran has created *A Modern Job* (An Essay on the Problem of Evil. Authorized translation by Fred Rothwell. Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago), better adapted, according to his views, to the warped mentality of the present age. The book is not without bright patches and soaring flights of eloquence; yet, as a solution of the problem of evil we must reject it. It is a medley of pantheism, undogmatic Christianity, and other ingredients. Not from such sources do men draw comfort in the dark hour of trial. As a human document, and as an evidence of the bankruptcy of modern thought, it is of great interest.

Books Received.

SCRIPTURAL.

THE NATURE AND HISTORY OF THE BIBLE. By the Right Rev. William Aloysius Fletcher, D. D., Rector of the Cathedral, Baltimore. J. H. Furst Co., Baltimore. 1917. Pp. xiv—175.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

MANNA OF THE SOUL. A Little Book of Prayer for Men and Women. Compiled by the Rev. F. X. Lasance, author of *My Prayer-Book*, etc. Vest-pocket edition. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. ix—375. Price: silk cloth, \$0.40; leather, \$0.60 to \$3.00.

IS THERE SALVATION OUTSIDE THE CATHOLIC CHURCH? Authorized translation from the French of the Rev. J. Bainvel, S.J. By the Rev. J. L. Weidenhan, S.T.L. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1917. Pp. 68. Price, \$0.50.

A MANUAL OF THE HISTORY OF DOGMAS. Vol. I: The Development of Dogmas during the Patristic Age, 100—869. By the Rev. Bernard J. Otten, S.J., Professor of Dogmatic Theology and the History of Dogmas in St. Louis University. B. Herder, St. Louis and London. 1917. Pp. 523. Price, \$2.00.

MORAL SERIES (CATHOLIC LIBRARY). By Roderick MacEachen, priest of Columbus Diocese. Vol. I: Principles, Laws, Virtues, Sin. Pp. 180. Vol. II: Precepts, First Commandment. Pp. 198. Vol. III: Commandments of God. Pp. 212. Vol. IV: Justice and Rights. Pp. 189. Vol. V: Precepts of the Church, Special Questions, Index to the Five Volumes. Pp. 208. Catholic Book Co., Wheeling, W. Va. 1916.

POUR LA CROISADE DU XXE SIÈCLE. Sermons et Conférences. Par Th. Delmont, Prélat de la Maison de Sa Sainteté, Docteur ès-lettres, Professeur aux Facultés Catholiques de Lyon. Bloud & Gay, Paris et Barcelone. 1917. Pp. 352.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE ESSENTIALS OF PHILOSOPHY. By R. W. Sellars, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, University of Michigan. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1917. Pp. 301. Price, \$1.60.

AN INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY. By H. P. Farrell, M. A., formerly Principal and Professor of History, Dagram Jethmal Sind College, Karachi. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1917. Pp. 220. Price, \$1.25 *net*.

THE MEXICAN PROBLEM. By Clarence W. Barron. With Introduction by Talcott Williams, LL.D. Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston and New York. 1917. Pp. xxix—137. Price, \$1.00 *net*.

HISTORICAL.

LUTHER. By Hartmann Grisar, S. J., Professor at the University of Innsbruck. Vol. VI. Authorized translation by E. M. Lamond. Edited by Luigi Cappadelta. B. Herder Book Co. St. Louis. 1917. Pp. 551. Price, \$3.25.

THE CENTENARY OF THE SOCIETY OF MARY. Prologue—The Centenary: A Retrospect and a Prospect. Historical Sketch: The Rev. William Joseph Chaminate, Founder of the Society of Mary. Historical Sketch: The Brothers of Mary in the United States. By Brother John E. Garvin, S.M. Seventy illustrations. Brothers of Mary, Mt. St. John, Dayton, Ohio or Chaminade College, Clayton, Mo. 1917. Pp. 284.

THE LIFE OF MOTHER PAULINE VON MALLINCKRODT. Foundress of the Sisters of Christian Charity, Daughters of the Blessed Virgin Mary of the Immaculate Conception. With an Introduction by the Most Rev. George W. Mundelein, D.D., Archbishop of Chicago. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 264. Price, \$1.50 *net*.

CHRONICLES OF AN OLD MISSOURI PARISH. Historical Sketches of St. Michael's Church, Fredericktown, Madison Co. By the Rev. John Rothensteiner. Published under the Auspices of the Knights of Columbus of Fredericktown. "Amerika" Print, St. Louis. 1917. Pp. 87.

A YEAR OF COSTA RICAN NATURAL HISTORY. By Amelia Smith Calvert, Sometime Fellow in Biology, Bryn Mawr College, and Philip Powell Calvert, Professor of Zoology, University of Pennsylvania, Editor of "Entomological News". With Maps and Illustrations. The Macmillan Company, New York. 1917. Pp. 596.

LES FRANCAISES ET LA GRANDE GUERRE. Par Berthem-Bontoux. Préface François Veuillot. Bloud & Gay, Paris et Barcelone. 1917. Pp. 288.

DISCOURS A L'HOPITAL (Hôtel Thiers—Institute de France). 24 Septembre, 1914—31 Décembre, 1915. Par Frédéric Masson, de l'Académie française. Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1916. Pp. 107. Prix, 1 fr. 50.

GUERRE DE RELIGIONS. Par Frédéric Masson, de l'Académie française. Bloud & Gay, Paris. 1917. Pp. 109.

"PAGES ACTUELLES" (1914—1916): No. 101, *Le Dieu allemand*. Par Denys Cochin, de l'Académie française, Ministre d'État. Pp. 64. No. 102, *La France, les Catholiques et la Guerre*. Réponse à Quelques Objections. Par Mgr. Alfred Baudrillart, Recteur de l'Institut Catholique de Paris, Directeur du Comité Catholique de Propagande Française à l'Etranger. Pp. 72. Bloud & Gay, Paris et Barcelone. 1917. Prix, 0 fr. 60.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE EBB AND FLOW OF LIFE. New Stories for Old and Young in Four Volumes. By Conrad Kümmel. Translated from the third and fourth German editions with the permission of the author by a Father of St. Bede Abbey, Peru, Illinois. 1917. Pp. 452, 448, 435 and 415. Price, \$5.00 a set, *net*.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(LVII).—NOVEMBER, 1917.—No. 5.

THE SERMON, THE CONGREGATION, AND THE PREACHER.

THE ideal result of preaching is realized when an excellent sermon is preached to a sympathetic congregation by a capable preacher. If fault be found in the sermon or the congregation or the preacher, effort is to that extent wasted. Only in the happy conjunction of all three elements do we find full spiritual profit. A good sermon is a blessing to all who hear it. A dull sermon is an affliction. A congregation which takes a mistaken attitude toward preaching will rarely find spiritual profit in any sermon whatsoever. A congregation may be well disposed and an excellent sermon may be at hand. If it is delivered badly it becomes a spiritual trial. If it is delivered well it is an inspiration. Many of those who find indiscriminate fault with preaching overlook the fundamental fact that at best the preacher can control only himself and his sermon. He cannot control the general attitude of the congregation. Of course, the charms of intelligence and eloquence are supreme. The exceptional preacher blessed with both gifts will nearly always dominate any congregation which he addresses. But the average preacher who might be highly effective with a sympathetic congregation is baffled when his gifts are not great enough to overcome perverted attitudes toward preaching in general. When the spiritual sense is dulled and flippant indifference is widespread, no preaching will avail.

THE SERMON.

It is not easy to discover the exact place of the sermon in our organized religious life. Whether its mission is to convey instruction, to chasten the sinner, to deal from an apologetic

standpoint with Catholic dogma, to serve as an agency for high moral appeal and spiritual awakening, is not quite clear to either the average preacher or the average congregation. Perhaps it is the function of the sermon to do all of these and anything else in addition which will promote the welfare of souls. Nevertheless a clear understanding of the uses of the sermon is necessary if it is to be efficacious. Fairly wide inquiry made among the laity and the clergy failed to bring forth any clear understanding of what preaching had meant in the lives of those consulted. The uses of oratory vary as times vary. Hence, the uses of the sermon in organized Church life will change in response to changed conditions. Sermons in Sunday newspapers, enriched by every charm of style and scholarship, kill interest in an indifferent sermon from the pulpit, particularly if the preacher is indifferent to the power of both style and scholarship.

The circumstances of Sunday Mass have played havoc with preaching. Where a congregation is large and Mass is celebrated every hour from sunrise until noon, one congregation must depart before another enters. Promiscuous announcements must be made. Many Communion must be distributed. The forenoon schedule is prepared so exactly that only ten or twelve minutes will be allowed for a sermon. The preacher vies with the congregation in eagerness to be done with it. If there is leisure for a longer sermon at a late Mass or in the evening, there is little disposition to welcome it, and there are systematic efforts to avoid it. The sermon is crowded into such narrow quarters that it loses prestige. It is in bad repute. On the whole, people take an attitude of mild suspicion or amiable toleration toward it. A joke went the rounds of the press recently to the effect that short sermons, "sermonettes", are very popular in summer—and also in autumn, winter, and spring. On a certain occasion a lecturer was invited to address a highly educated audience. A member of the committee which extended the invitation told him that the lecture might be moral, provided it was not offensive. He chose a literary subject in whose title the word "virtue" appeared. He lectured to empty seats. He was informed later that the prospective audience feared that a sermon was to be preached and remained away.

To an extent preaching has lost its prestige among clergyman themselves. The habit of preaching without preparation, and the pleasant tone in which we invite a fellow priest to "say a few words", indicate that we have failed to hold the sermon secure in its high place as the historical method of expounding Revelation and rousing human hearts to supreme efforts in their sanctification. Long sermons, unreasonable sermons, tiresome sermons, superficial sermons, preached without judgment and at times without heart, have done their share in reducing the pulpit from its high Christian estate to a lowly place which robs it of so much of its power.

Let no one think for a moment that all of the fault may be laid upon the shoulders of the clergy. Far from it. When preaching is supported by current social indignations and aspirations it is powerful to the highest degree. But when the indignations of society do not concern themselves about the sins of the world, and our aspirations set the things of the soul far distant in the perspective of life, the preacher faces a situation which average ability in the pulpit cannot master. If the world loses the sense of truth and becomes indifferent to error of whatsoever kind, he who preaches truth may expect but little enthusiasm from those who hear. A related situation occurs as regards standards and doctrines which touch life directly. We live in a time of colossal social injustice. But exact determination of justice baffles the genius of the race. The attempts of the United States government during these days to fix prices show us the imperative need of exact standards and the practical impossibility of determining them. Now in as far as the preacher takes up questions of social injustice he will be driven to speak in very general and vague terms. This will give his preaching a certain emotional force, but it will do little in furnishing the direction needed for the formation of conscience in everyday life. Again, the average congregation represents every walk in life and many rugged social contrasts. It is difficult to preach with direct force without appearing to give very great offence which will be understood without difficulty. Nathan's direct method with David was in personal contact, not in a sermon. As a result of circumstances of these kinds sermons gravitate toward individual personal aspects of morality and toward general terms. This sets

the pulpit in second place in the formation of the conscience of the world, and it places every preacher who enters the pulpit under a discouraging handicap.

The sermon should be studied in the light of all of its bearings in our organized religious life. There is much difference between the early morning five-minute instruction and a powerful sermon delivered on a great occasion. There will be differences in style, spirit, and content between the familiar talk to a sodality or other parish organization on the one hand and a general congregation on the other. There will be many differences between an instruction on points of doctrine and a profound moral appeal intended to set forth the ideals of Christian life in their most compelling splendor. Our failure to recognize these differences and to adapt, with thoughtful care, style, content, and spirit to purpose is both our fault and our misfortune. Perhaps our greatest mistake has been to associate rambling announcements of every kind with the actual delivery of sermons in the pulpit. The printed record of everything said in three hundred city churches on a given Sunday would make a searching commentary on the place of the pulpit in the present-day world. Our failure to distinguish types of preaching, their real function, and their relation to other forms of instruction and appeal, is inexcusable.

THE CONGREGATION.

The following is found in a life of John Bunyan. "One day the minister preached against Sabbath breaking and Bunyan who used especially to follow his sports on Sundays, fell in conscience under that sermon, verily believed that it was intended for him and feeling what guilt was, which he could not remember that he had ever felt before. Home he went with a great burden upon his spirit; but dinner removed that burden; his animal spirits recovered from their depression; he shook the sermon out of his mind, and away he went with great delight, to his old sports." Bunyan's experience was typical. The power and the limitations of sermons are exactly indicated in it. Conversion and spiritual aspiration may be traced in many lives to a single sermon, rarely to a series of sermons. The average attitude toward sermons found in the modern congregation is that of an unconcerned impersonal observer. The

sermon is a church tradition. It is to be accepted like other church traditions. The people submit if it is tiresome and listen contentedly if it is interesting. When it is over, as when High Mass is over, the matter is at an end. The comments heard as congregations pour forth from the church after sermons, show the point of view from which the sermon was heard. It was "grand", "fine", "enjoyed", "tiresome", "useless", "preached before". Not often do we see the people depart from the church with their heads bent in quiet sorrow for sin or with eyes brilliant with renewed assurance of spiritual peace and reënforced dependence upon the benevolence of God. Not often, do the hearers depart with the comforting sense of spiritual understanding, with new and convincing light on the mysteries of doctrine, with helpful self-knowledge and strengthened resolution. Not often do the hearers depart feeling that the priest who addressed them had peered into their hearts, had spoken with unaccustomed authority, and had shown the spiritual mastery for which they longed. Like John Bunyan, most of us lose what the sermon gave us, through the comforting influence of a good dinner.

Let us relieve the preacher of blame and attempt to find the cause of this condition elsewhere. Social customs tyrannize over us. We are forbidden to express our deeper spiritual emotions in public. A conventional deference toward others and conventional understanding of privacy impose self-restraint upon us. They forbid us to express our inner spiritual experience. The habit therefore of suppressing religious emotions tends to paralyze us. This process creates an attitude which causes a back pressure against the effect of the sermon and leaves us hardened. Just as we behold a wholesome play and enjoy its art impersonally without improving character, we find genuine spiritual joy in hearing a good sermon but carry little permanent effect from it into daily life. Apropos of the customary question, "How did you like the Sermon?" the *Northwestern Christian Advocate* was quoted recently, as follows:

Asking that question has become a habit which it will probably take centuries to eradicate. It is a demon which can be cast out only by prayer and fasting. No wonder spiritual results of preaching

are so meagre. What can be expected from preaching unless laymen realize that they are to follow up the work of persuasion by driving home the word set forth by the preacher? Sermons are not toys to be played with, or pretty pieces of rhetoric on which every member of the congregation is expected to pass judgment. A sermon is not an exquisite bit of literary bric-à-brac to be chattered over and judged by the technical rules of art. It is not a dumpling into which every self-constituted critic is invited to stick his fork that he may praise or condemn the cook. A sermon is a solemn warning, a bugle-call to duty, a burning condemnation, an earnest stroke against a giant wrong, an exhortation to high endeavor, the illumination of a majestic truth. Sermons are preached, not to be liked, but to be accepted and lived. Suppose, pray, you did not like the sermon! What of it? The preachers in the New Testament were not anxious that their sermons should be liked.

Never ask that insipid question, "How did you like the sermon?" Such a question injures the one who asks it, and debauches the person who answers. It trains men to measure sermons by false standards, and to seek for entertainment rather than for truth.

Suppression of spiritual emotion is one factor that neutralizes the effect of preaching. Another factor is found in the circumstance that our religious activity is organized in cycles and is thereby robbed of much spontaneity. We live and think and judge ourselves spiritually from Communion to Communion, from confession to confession, from ecclesiastical season to ecclesiastical season, from Sunday Mass to Sunday Mass. These spiritual nodes lead us to think backward to one time and forward to another, and they rob us of the impulse to act out a spiritual emotion at the time we feel it. If a man is stirred profoundly by a sermon, his impulse to change his way of living will be checked by his habit of going to confession only at stated periods. When confession day arrives, the bounding impulse which had been awakened by a sermon may have lost its strength. Perhaps the fatherly heart of Pius X fostered the hope that daily Communion might put an end to these cycles or periods in our spiritual life and hold it permanently on a higher level.

A third factor in the general attitude of the congregation is found in the vague assurance of present possession of truth and of easy opportunity for reform when it is wished. We miss in the people an attitude of solicitude for the truth, an

eagerness to know more and more about God and His ways and the mysteries of life. There results from our definiteness of doctrine and worship an attitude of spiritual quiet and assurance which is often mistaken for indifference. It is really assurance, not indifference. Of course, definiteness is a mental opiate. Religion takes on its full meaning in our experience from our sense of the need of it. If we feel that we have need of sermons, they become all-powerful to us. If we feel that we do not need the sermon, either for instruction or emotional awakening, we look upon it as a spiritual luxury. There are very many who would be conscious of no spiritual loss whatever if they heard no sermons. How can any preacher help those who are thus minded?

Three elements in the attitude of the congregation have been mentioned; conventional suppression of aroused spiritual emotion, obedience to it at only stated times which involves habitual postponement of action; lack of a sense of real spiritual need of sermons owing to definiteness that is the result of spiritual assurance. No desire is felt to force these observations further than facts warrant. The inquiries made in the preparation of this study show that the three elements are widespread and active. In order to determine more accurately their force, we have need of a background in which to judge the sermon. It is supplied in the parish mission.

The mission has been so organized into the life of Catholics as to have become a spiritual New Year's Day. The emotions, practices, inspirations, and sentiment that we attach to the New Year cluster around the mission as a time of spiritual renewal. Many who have been indifferent to their religious duties resume faithfully the practice of them at the time of a mission. Those who have been faithful make resolutions to rise to still nobler things. Timid sinners who wish to repent but are ashamed to do so because it makes them conspicuous, become brave and sensible at the time of a mission. They are unashamed of the tears which gratitude and joy sprinkle about them like an "asperges", making them "whiter than snow". The solicitude of friends who have hoped to win back loved ones who have wandered, finds new courage and occasion for urging at the time of a mission. The pastor takes opportunity to arouse the better self in each member of the congregation.

One would have difficulty in finding out the range of awakened spiritual impulse and renewed spiritual life that must be credited to parish missions. One would not find it easy to count the luminous pathways of those who have never departed from the better life thus begun. Who shall count the hearts to which happiness has been restored, the homes to which peace has returned, the hearts to which Christ has come back as to loved and purified tabernacles? Blessed be he to whom we owe the parish mission.

The mission draws out the consciousness of spiritual unity of the parish. It reasserts the supernatural in life. It becomes the chief topic of conversation at the family table. Happy surprise and wholesome edification are found in everything that occurs. Spiritual sensibilities are made acute. Good impulses, no longer held in leash, play freely on the sunlit plains of the soul, ecstatic in their new-found strength. The moral enthusiasms of younger and holier days are saved from the creeping paralysis of indifferent years and their full spiritual vigor is brought back to them. Every faculty within one helps grace to drive enemies from within the ramparts of the soul. The better self recovers its jurisdiction over life. It becomes again the spiritual monarch ruling in the name of God.

The sermon is the supreme weapon of the missionary. The preacher is a specialist in preaching. Sermons are well prepared. The congregation is in an ideal mood to hear the sermon and obey its touch. Souls are alert and well disposed, ready for contrition, eager for guidance toward higher spiritual levels whose charm had been obscured by the dust of the world, if not by the storm clouds of passion and sin. Those who had wandered away ask to be led back to the assured safety of peaceful valleys lit by the Presence of God. Two-thirds of the power of the mission sermon is in the attitude of the congregation, not in the sermon itself, nor in the preacher.

The parish mission is so organized and its atmosphere is so constituted that advantage is taken immediately of every effect of preaching. Souls that feel called to better things may at once seek advice and find it. The sinner whose conscience is aroused may make his peace with God and find happiness before the evening Angelus marks the close of day.

The confessional is open from morning until midnight. Qualified directors of souls, free from all distracting cares of parish management, specialists in the work, are at everyone's service throughout the day and into the night. One is no longer supposed to suppress spiritual emotion because good form requires it. One feels no impulse to postpone action until some remote confession day. One feels no longer contented with the easy assurance toward which one drifts in ordinary times. The sermon comes into its own. It is well prepared and well delivered. It is preached to a congregation that is open-minded, in which everyone is eager for guidance and strength. The supernatural is seen again and every one of its compelling claims is recognized with faithful zeal. The picture gives to us at least an intimation of the scenes in Galilee when our Lord was preacher and His sermons were incomparable masterpieces of Divine wisdom, and weary eyes looked into the Divine countenance of God as He brought peace and assurance to their burdened hearts.

THE PREACHER.

Many discouraging remarks are heard about modern preaching. There are now so many types of capable lecturers, such evidences of learning and instances of attractive style, that the pulpit orator is compelled to attain to a high degree of excellence before he attracts the attention that gives him power. Our impression as to the scarcity of high-grade preachers may be due to the fact that we have many excellent preachers. Where there is a high average of excellence in any line the supply of greatness seems to diminish. Furthermore, the preacher has no longer any semblance of monopoly in the propaganda of moral and spiritual ideals. Social workers of every type, scholars, statesmen, and newspapers, magazines, and an increasing number of admirably written works, are devoted to moral and social propaganda in a way to diminish the actual as well as the relative rôle of pulpit oratory.

No priest and no one else can do his best all the time. No one is called upon to do so. But every priest ought to understand his powers as well as his limitations. He ought to know the kind of sermon that he can preach with best effect. The preacher should respect his own limitations and accept them

as signs of the negative Will of God. St. Francis de Sales, in his altogether delightful letter to the Archbishop of Bourges on the art of preaching, covers this point admirably. "A preacher always knows enough when he does not wish to seem to know more than he does know. If we do not know how to speak well on the mysteries of the Trinity, let us say nothing about it. If we are not well equipped for explaining the "*In the beginning*", then let us leave it alone. There is no lack of other topics more useful; there is no obligation to do everything." The priest's entire career as a preacher ought to be understood and kept in mind systematically. He should assemble in his library the sources of which he has need. He should organize his reading and study as these bear on his grasp of spiritual truth and increase his power to declare it. He should foster the deep moral passion which is the single source of power for all preaching. He should have a decent respect for standards of style, composition, and delivery. He should be willing to spare no pains to add charm of voice and delivery and composition to those of divine truth in standing as the representative of God to deliver to God's children the Divine message. Every priest has had opportunity to learn and realize the sacredness of the work of preaching. Every priest has had opportunity to fit himself for the work. Every priest knows that not arbitrary assumptions and preferences but definite laws of psychology and expected graces condition his efficiency in doing this duty. Every priest is exposed to the danger of making certain mistakes which hinder him from doing the work of God as God would have it done.

Cardinal Newman tells us, as we well know, that men, not angels, are the ministers of the Gospel. A pastor's congregation tends to become commonplace to him. He looks into the same faces Sunday after Sunday and year after year. This experience may dull the sense of profound reverence which every priest should feel toward all human souls, but particularly toward those committed to his immediate charge. A pastor who is reasonably faithful will be conscious of stimulation to much greater effort in preaching when he addresses a congregation other than his own, or appears at a public gathering for some purpose not definitely religious. It requires no little watchfulness and the greatest industry for a

pastor to find in his own congregation sufficient occasion to give the best that is in him every time he appears in the pulpit. Only great occasions call forth great orations. Theoretically an emergency is always at hand, eternity always at stake in every life. But it is impossible for us to realize this or act upon it.

The pastor is exposed also to the fallacy of underrating the intelligence of his congregation and of overrating the effect of his own mediocre efforts. A scholar has well said that the simplest results of thinking are not the results of simple thinking. Pastors may assume that there is not much need of effort or deep thinking or wide reading to prepare sermons for their flocks. But no priest who understands the simplicity and power of Christ's words, who is filled with honest reverence for souls, can believe that a superficial talk, quite unprepared, can mean as much as a sermon into whose preparation prayer, effort, and reading have entered.

Another difficulty, perhaps the most serious one which a priest meets, results from indiscriminate praise of everything that he says in the pulpit. Any public speaker who has normal human impulses likes to be told that he has done well, and suffers when told that he has done badly. If the people had courage enough to withhold praise except when it is deserved, and if they had intelligence enough to realize when it is deserved, preaching would be transformed in a year. I do not believe that a preacher can do his best unless he find out in some way the real effect of his preaching in human lives. How to obtain that knowledge without being hurt by the process is a problem for which no solution is at hand unless the preacher can have an intelligent and friendly critic who fears not to tell the truth.

There is such an abundance of literature on pulpit oratory, on sermon writing and the faults of preachers, that it seems gratuitous to add to it; and yet our preaching has not reached a degree of excellence that this abundance should have made possible and the dignity of the work should have made sure. In a certain sense a priest can preach only himself. His sermons are part of his life. They declare the spiritual views which he holds. Every time that he addresses with deliberate care his congregation, he reveals just what he thinks of human

souls, just what he aims at and just what he is. There is no escape. Only a careless man preaches a careless sermon. Only a superficial man preaches a superficial sermon. Only a reverent and faithful priest preaches a sermon whose spirit breathes reverence and invites loyalty to God.

The priest who is luminously certain of God and of himself, who realizes that every day should show some new unfolding of the majesty and power of God, will never lack material for preaching, nor power in his words. The priest who saves himself from the deadly paralysis of routine and who quickens the springs of life in his daily meditation and prayer will be humble, industrious, and painstaking in everything that he does. He will find both reason and occasion for putting into his sermons the best that is in him, as nothing else than that is worthy of the Divine Master for whom He speaks.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

THE CORRESPONDENCE OF SAINT AUGUSTINE AND SAINT JEROME—A STUDY.

FOR some time between the beginning of the year 382 and the end of 384 Saint Jerome and Saint Augustine were quite certainly both resident at Rome. Saint Jerome had returned after his first sojourn in the East not long after the close of the first general Council of Constantinople, which held its last session about the end of July, 381. The interests of the Church ("ecclesiastica necessitas"), he says, brought him to Rome together with Paulinus, the Catholic Bishop of Antioch, and Epiphanius, the Bishop of Salamina or Constantia in Cypress.¹ His stay in Rome on this occasion was almost three years.² He states, moreover, quite definitely that it was dur-

¹ Denique, cum et me Romam cum sanctis pontificibus Paulino et Epiphanio ecclesiastica traxisset necessitas, Epist. CXXVII, n. 7, Cf. Epist. CVIII, n. 6.

References and quotations in this paper will correspond to the numbers as arranged in the Vallarsi and Migne editions of the printed works of Saint Jerome. The same correspondence may be found in the Benedictine edition of the works of Saint Augustine, Paris, 1689, reprinted in the Migne, but with varying numbers.

² "Pene certe triennium cum eis vixi," Epist. XLV, n. 2. In this letter Jerome lets us see also what was the manner of his life at Rome, the consolations of congenial surroundings, the high esteem in which he was held, and

ing the month of August that he left the Roman port, never to return.³ This evidently was August of the year 385, some months after the election of the successor to Pope Damasus, who died in December of 384. The remaining thirty-five years of Jerome's life were to be given to the service of the Church, not as adviser or secretary to the Pope, or even as successor in the See of Saint Peter;⁴ but as the virile ascetic, whose silent example and strenuous student life make the strongest appeal always and the best apology for the doctrines and ideals which he defends.

Augustine nowhere tells us the exact time of his going to Rome. He has told us what his motives were in leaving the schools of Carthage to teach at Rome. He has described some of the circumstances, his leaving his mother in Africa, his illness at Rome, his experience with the scheming dishonesty of Roman students, his going to Milan; but for other details of time we are left entirely to inferences drawn from facts aside, and occasional statements referring to his stay at Rome and Milan. We know that he was at Rome long enough to be brought to the very door of death by a serious illness, probably the Roman malaria, that he recovered sufficiently to open a private school of rhetoric and literature, and to discover, to his disgust, that the Roman students had traits of character or acquired qualities far worse than the rowdiness which he sought to escape when he left the schools of Carthage. A number of the students would conspire, he says, to tell their master that they were not satisfied with him, or his methods, and pass on to another school, leaving their fees to be collected on account. Augustine could not afford to lose his fees; hence when a request came from Milan for a teacher of rhetoric, he applied for the appointment, won the commission, and was

the insincerity of jealous schemers which finally drove him from the city. "Multa me virginum crebro turba circumdedit. Divinos Libros, ut potui, nonnullis saepe disserui. Lectio assiduitatem, assiduitas familiaritatem, familiaritas fiduciam fecerat. Dicant quid unquam in me aliter senserint quam Christianum decebat? Antequam domum sanctae Paulae nossem totius in me urbis studia consonabant. Omnium pene iudicio dignus summo sacerdotio discernebar. Beatae memoriae Damasus meus sermo erat. Discebar sanctus, discebar humilis et disertus." But: "Osculabantur mihi manus quidam, et ore vipereo detrahebant. Alius incessum meum calumniabatur et risum; ille vultui detrahebat, hic in simplicitate aliud suspicabatur."

³ Contra Ruffinum, Lib. III, n. 22.

⁴ Epist. ut supra, ad Asellam, XLV, n. 3.

sent by public conveyance, probably over the ancient post roads, to the episcopal city of Saint Ambrose, the man destined, under God, to open his mind to the meaning of rhetoric and the use of human eloquence.⁵ We know that Augustine was teaching in Milan before the first day of January, 385, when he says that he read an address in eulogy of the consul Bauto in the city of imperial residence.⁶ We would be probably not far wrong if we were to infer from these facts that Augustine left Carthage after the close of the school year, 383, expecting to begin the next school term in Rome, that his leaving for Milan was in the early fall of the following year, that his stay at Rome covers approximately the actual school year 383-384 and a part of the summer vacation of each, altogether a little more than a year.

Though resident together in Rome for probably more than a year, it is quite certain that Augustine and Jerome were at this time entire strangers. They had no interests in common, and Augustine says expressly in his first letter (LVI), that he knows Jerome only from the description given him by Alypius, who had returned lately from a visit to the Holy Land.

Ten years brought many changes for both. In the year 394 Jerome was established, and quite at home in his self-chosen exile at Bethlehem. Augustine, now a child of Mother Church, back again in his native Africa, a priest since 389, just passed the fortieth year of his life, was beginning to feel the power of his mind in the grasp and development of the Catholic thought of earlier witnesses of the faith. This development of thought and its orthodox expression were evidently in the mind of Augustine when he wrote his first letter to Jerome in 394. The text and subject matter of the correspondence show it. Moreover we can readily understand, knowing the position of Augustine, a new-comer in the Church of Africa and the Church Catholic, that it would be to his advantage to feel that he had the friendship and support of a man who had stood the test of trial as Jerome had. There was security in knowing that he could have the confidence of the man who had been the counselor of Pope Damasus, and whose clean life and reputa-

⁵ Confess. Lib. V. cap. 8, 12, 13.

⁶ Contra Epist. Petil. III, c. 25, n. 30.

tion as an ascetic had suffered nothing from the insinuations and slurs of an unfriendly faction at Rome.

In the Vallarsi edition of the works of Saint Jerome, Venice, 1735, reprinted by the Migne editors, are seventeen letters of correspondence between Augustine and Jerome, nine from Jerome to Augustine, and eight from Augustine to Jerome. One letter, at least, is lost. Augustine, in his second letter (LXVII) refers to a letter which he has received in reply to a "greeting" signed by himself and sent to Jerome. This "reply" could not have been an answer to Augustine's former letter which was much more than a "greeting", which in fact never reached Jerome, and made the writing of the second necessary, a repetition of the problems of the first.

These seventeen letters contain points of very general interest. They give us light, not new light altogether, but direct and first-hand evidence on some of the difficulties of correspondence in those times, when letters were sent almost always by private messengers, when a reply depended usually on the chance return of another messenger or carrier. They show us what was the standard of Christian thought of the time, not the exclusive culture of a few only, but the living and practical form which was reflected in the faith and daily life of the people. They evidence also the peculiar temper and the wide difference of temperament of these two men, whom succeeding ages have learned to love and admire for the solid good sense and the practical, working virtues which are characteristic of the Saints.

The text of the first letter of Augustine makes it clear that the purpose of the correspondence was to be the mutual advantage of a commerce of ideas. He asks for books. "And with me the whole body of the churches of Africa, eager to learn", he says, "asks that you give some care and time to the translating of the books of those who have written in Greek on the subject of our Scriptures. You will thus make us acquainted with the thoughts of those men, and especially that one to whom you refer most frequently in your written works" [Origen].

Another request of Augustine shows how he valued the work of the great translator, and what he thought of the discerning accuracy which ought to characterize a critical version and re-

vision of the Bible. "But, in turning the sacred canonical Scriptures into Latin, I would wish to see your work done only after the manner in which you did the book of Job, so that it would appear, by the marks which you use, what are the differences [in text] between your translation and the Septuagint". (Epist. LVI):

Augustine next comes to a point which, by reason of the peculiar circumstances of its reaching Jerome, was the occasion of offence and probably ten years of distrust and misunderstanding.

Jerome had gathered from various sources, as he says, the interpretations and commentaries of earlier writers on the Epistles of Saint Paul. These, together with his own reflections or impressions, had been circulated, it appears, under Jerome's name, and were regarded as his running commentaries on the Epistles. The collection had reached Augustine. He tells Jerome that he has read them; but there is one point on which he cannot agree. The fact that Saint Paul "withstood" Saint Peter "to the face" at Antioch, (Galat. 2:11) must be understood, he believes, as a literal fact. It may not be explained away as a mere statement made for effect, to convince or reconcile a party, the Judaizing party in the early Church.

This letter never reached Saint Jerome, at least not directly and in its original form. It was to have been carried by Profuturus. But, while preparing for the voyage, Profuturus was elected Bishop of Cirta in Northern Africa, and shortly after died.

From the text of the second letter of Augustine (LXVII), written probably three years later, it is quite clear that he knows now that his former letter has not reached Jerome. "Scripseram jam hinc aliquando ad te Epistolam, quae non perlata est." After acknowledging the receipt of a short letter in answer to a still briefer "greeting" which he had sent to Jerome, probably carried by the pilgrims traveling between Africa and the Holy Land, he inquires about the *title* of a book, which we easily recognize to be Jerome's *List of Ecclesiastical Writers*. "We have lately acquired it," he says, "but do not know its title. The first page of this codex, where the title usually is, has no inscription. The brother by whom it

was acquired says that it is called the *Epitaph*. We would readily accept this as the title you wish to give it; but as many of those whose life or writings are there noted were still living when the work was issued, we wonder why you either gave it such a name or allowed it to be so called."

Augustine then returns to the subject of his former letter, and repeats in substance his reasons for rejecting any interpretation of the words of Saint Paul (Galat. 2: 11) which would admit a falsehood into the sacred text. Referring to a passage in the classical legend, he appeals to Jerome to exercise Christian severity against himself, to correct this work, to sing the "*palinode*", not for the honor of the Trojan Helen, but for the nobler beauty of Christian truth.

By a series of rather unusual coincidents this second letter also went astray. The voyager who was to have carried it faltered at the dangers of the sea, and did not go. The letter, however, was seen by someone who either had a sufficient interest in it, or the meddling curiosity to make a copy. Copies were manifolded, apparently without Augustine's knowledge, and widely circulated in Italy and at Rome, where there was a party certainly unfriendly to Jerome.

It must have been fully five years after this letter was written originally that the rumor reached Augustine of some of its strange wanderings, the capital that was being made of it against Jerome, and the fact that Jerome is offended and believes himself wronged. His next letter to Jerome goes right to the point.

I have heard that letters of mine have reached you. I have not been honored with an answer. The fault is, I presume, not yours. But surely there must be something wrong somewhere. . . . This also was reported to me which I am slow to believe, though I do not hesitate to write you about it. Briefly, as it was told me, a report is said to have reached you by some of our brethren that I have written a book against you, and sent it to Rome. This is false. As God is our witness I have done no such thing. But, if there is in anything that I have written, any point on which I do not agree with you, you ought to know, and, if you could not know, then, as I think, you ought to believe that such a point is not stated in opposition to you, but because I believe it to be right. Know, moreover, that whatever may offend you in what I have written, is so written that I am will-

ing, even eager to hear what you have to say on the other side of the problem, either to be corrected myself or to be assured of your good will. This I ask you [in fairness]; I demand it.

Jerome's answer to this letter shows how keenly he felt the thrust in the dark, the surreptitious circulating of Augustine's letter calling on him to sing the "*palinode*." He is ready to accept Augustine's offer of good will; but in justice he demands an explanation. He requires evidence direct and clear that Augustine is not responsible for the attempt to hurt his reputation at Rome for orthodoxy or critical acumen.

Your letter reached me wherein you say that you did not send a book to Rome against me. That is not [exactly] what I heard. But copies of someone's letter were brought here by Sysinnius, a deacon, one of our brethren. This letter is addressed to me, and in it you exhort me to sing the "*palinode*" on a certain text of the *Apostle*. . . I acknowledge that though the style (*επιχειρηματα*) is like your own, yet I have thought it hardly prudent to answer on the strength of the mere copy of a letter; lest, hurt by my reply, you might justly make the answer, and write back that I should have proven first that the letter is yours, and genuine. . . . If, therefore, the letter is yours acknowledge it openly, or send copies that are certainly genuine; that we may thus enter upon this discussion about the meaning of Scripture without the insecurity of personal distrust, and either correct our own mistakes, or show that we were wrong in blaming another.

Knowing the circumstances of Jerome's leaving Rome, his feelings then, as he describes them in the letter to Asella (XLV)—*O Invidia, primum mordax tui*—we need not ascribe his suspicion of Augustine's motives to supersensitiveness, or the fear that his personal reputation might suffer in the Church of the West. The uncompromising asceticism of Jerome, his plain language in speaking of the *near virtues* of some easy-going clerics had given offence. He knew that he had made enemies. He despised them, it is true; and he knew how to express disdain for their scheming methods. "*Quod me damnant episcopi non est ratio, sed conspiratio; nolo ille vel ille respondeat, quorum me auctoritas opprimere potest, docere non potest;*" again: "*Subulci non aderunt, scropha non grunniet*" (Epist. L).

But circumstances certainly had the appearance of incriminating Augustine. The facts seemed to bear out the sus-

picion suggested by Jerome's friends, that Augustine was making a bid for popularity and a reputation at Jerome's expense. "Nonnulli; familiares mei . . . suggerebant non simplici animo a te factum, sed laudem atque rumusculos et gloriam populi requirente, ut de nobis cresceres; ut multi cognoscerent te provocare, me timere; te scribere ut doctum, me tacere ut imperitum."

Added to this was the fact that the letter had been copied, manifolded, and circulated in Italy and at Rome, just where it was imperative that Jerome's reputation should not suffer, where his good name was identified with his cause, the cause for which he left Rome, and chose the life of an exile. "Satis mirari nequeo", he writes, "quomodo ipsa epistola et Romae et in Italia haberi a plerisque dicatur, et ad me solum non pervenerit, cui soli missa est; praesertim cum ipse frater Sysinnius inter coeteros Tractatus tuos dixerit eam se, non in Africa, non apud te, sed in insula Adriae ante hoc ferme quinquennium reperisse." (Epist. CV—n. 1.)

The wide circulation of this letter in Italy, at Rome, and the "Island of the Adriatic," seems to point to a concerted plan to hurt Jerome; and Jerome certainly believes that Augustine, or the one who wrote under Augustine's name, is the responsible author of the wrong. The whole tone of the two letters (CII and CV) to Augustine betrays deep feeling. For five years all the evidence in Jerome's hands has pointed to Augustine as the man who has allowed himself to be *used*, to be the tool of partisans, of an unfriendly clique, whose schemes he thought he had escaped when he settled at Bethlehem. While he expresses regard and affection for Augustine, if Augustine is sincere, he asks him to come out into the open and face him like a man. He shows the temper of a man conscious of his own power, nerved for the fray, fearless, and always strong even in his weakest point. He gives warning that he will waste no words with a sycophant.

In the meantime several letters were passing on the way. Jerome's first letter (CII), carried by Asterius, a subdeacon, was followed by a second (CIII), which was sent by Praesidius, a deacon, who carried also a packet of letters (*baiulum litterarum*), containing not improbably Jerome's answer to the invectives of Ruffinus. It is evident from Augustine's next

letter, the fourth of Augustine in the correspondence (CIV), that Jerome's two letters had not been received when this was sent. He gives no "*explanation*", which Jerome had demanded. He says, by way of preface, that he has an excellent opportunity and a trusted messenger by whom he sends another (the third) request for an answer to the same old problem about Jerome's interpretation of the text, Galatians, 2: 11.

The next letter in the correspondence, the fifth written by Augustine (CX), makes it clear that he has now received the three letters of Jerome (CII, CIII, CV), that he has a better knowledge of the character of the man to whom he has been writing, whom he has offended, as he sees now, and hurt perhaps in the esteem of others, by that unfortunate allusion to the *palinode*. Instead of a friendly interchange of views on religion and revelation he finds that he has been betrayed into a controversy, which he never sought or thought of, and that, with a master of polemics who has proved his power long since against Helvidius and Jovinian, and now lately against the Catholic Ruffinus.

The occasion was critical, and Augustine feared the result of Jerome's just indignation. Jerome had asked for a copy of the offensive letter signed by Augustine's own hand: "Aut mitte eamdem tua subscriptam manu, aut senem latitantem in cellula lacescere desine" (Epist. CV, n. 3). Jerome is clearly within his right in every demand that he makes on Augustine. Augustine is certainly alarmed at the misunderstanding occasioned by the mischievous, perhaps malicious, copying and circulating of his letter in Italy.

The copy of Augustine's original letter was then sent, as Jerome had requested, carried by the same messenger (Praesidius), who had brought the "packet of letters" from Jerome. Together with the *copy* of the old letter—the one which had been circulated in Italy—Augustine sent a reply to Jerome's last letter, and a short note of instruction addressed to Praesidius the carrier. In this note to Praesidius Augustine lets us see how much he dreads the prospect of a controversy with Jerome. "I am asking you in confidence", he writes to Praesidius, "to convey my letters to Jerome, our brother in the priesthood. But in order that you may know how you also are to write to him for me, I am sending you herewith copies of my own

letter to him (Jerome), and his letters to me. When you have read these you will see how extremely careful I have had to be, and how much he feels that he has been wronged. I have reason to dread his displeasure; and I am leaving it to your judgment, if there is anything in what I have said, or in my manner of saying it, that you send it not to him, but back to me, that I may correct it, and thus ask him to pardon any fault that I may have to acknowledge" (Epist. CXI).

Whether we attribute it to tact or policy or big-hearted Christian charity or practical good sense, one thing is certain, Augustine's letter (CX) meets Jerome fairly, and fairly disarms the veteran who has served notice that he will not refuse a challenge: "*Quod bos lassus fortius figat pedem*" (Epist. CII, n. 2).

Jerome has thrown down the gauntlet; but Augustine, conscious of no purpose to wrong Jerome, is resolved not to pick it up. "I will now at last", he writes, "reply to your letter which you sent me by Asterius, in which I find frequent expressions of your good will and love for me, and again evidences that I have grievously offended you. Where I was consoled and assured in reading this letter, there I found myself immediately within the range of your blows. What most of all impresses me is your saying that an answer to the copies of my letter was thought to be imprudent, lest I, *hurt* by your reply, should write back to tell you that it was your place to find out first and prove whether or not the letter is mine . . . far be it from me to take offence, if you can, or if you will make it clear to me and prove that you have succeeded better than I in getting the meaning of this text (Galat., 2: 11) of the Apostle's letter, or any other place in Scripture."

In the next paragraph Augustine succeeds, I think, in presenting the purely objective side of the whole difficulty. It illustrates a power, which few men have, of avoiding and keeping away from personalities and recriminations in controversy. Though it is quite impossible to do justice to the clear thought of the original, I shall attempt the translation.

It follows, therefore, that if you had had clear evidence that this letter was mine [genuine], you would have been ready to reply in writing in such a manner as to hurt me. Therefore, since I believe that you would not think of hurting me unjustly, it remains that I

must acknowledge my fault in the fact that I wronged you in those former letters, which I cannot deny are mine. Why then do I pull against the stream, why not ask your pardon at once? If I have wronged you, I do indeed beg of you by the gentleness of Christ to forgive me; and I ask you moreover not to wrong me in turn by returning evil for evil. But, if you conceal from me any error which you may have found in my words written or spoken, you do me a wrong. If, however, you find fault where there is no fault, you hurt yourself more than me. Far be this from you, your purpose, your life, and your habits of life, to do such a thing with the will to do wrong, to carp at and blame me, when in your heart you know there is no blame.

In this letter, which is in effect an apology—much more, however, than a mere excuse or a plea for pardon—Augustine makes only the briefest allusion to the text in controversy. He leaves it to Jerome's sense of fitness to answer his former request for an explanation, or, if he is in error, the "*palinode*".

There is one point of more than passing interest. Accustomed as we are to think of the commanding genius of Augustine, the man whose thought and expression have shaped the theology of later centuries, we can hardly imagine his motives, the purpose, or the need of sending clerics, the prospective priests of his diocese, from his own episcopal school to be taught in the hermitage at Bethlehem. Yet he states clearly that this is his design. He refers first to his long waiting for an answer to the letter which had wandered from his control. "De illis verbis Apostol: ad Galatas", he writes, "iuvenerim me ad tuam sanctitatem scripsisse meminerim, et ecce iam senex nec rescripta meruerim," Then expressing his confidence—sincerely, I think—in Jerome's knowledge of Scripture and classical culture, he says: "Tantae autem mihi in litteris tuis quae in manus nostras pervenire potuerunt, apparent res, ut nihil studiorum meorum mallet, si possem, quam inhaerere latere tuo. Quod, ego quia non possum, *aliquem nostrorum in Domino filiorum erudiendum nobis ad te mittere cogito*, si etiam de hac re tua rescripta meruero." The fact, moreover, that many of these letters were carried by clerics, by men in deacon's or subdeacon's orders, seems to indicate that other bishops of the African sees were sending their students or at any rate permitting them to go to the Holy Land with *litterae*

communicatoriae to get a working acquaintance with the places and scenes of our Lord's sacred human life.

Jerome's reply to this letter, and to the authentic copies of the former letters, is characteristic of the man. It reveals his strength at once and his weakness. It shows us a personality strong, nervous, out-spoken, straightforward, generous, sensitive, and offended at the very appearance of blame; he is yet humanly tender (not soft) in his expressions of feeling and affection for a friend. Was he too stern for the *mere* men of his time? Did his ideals find a readier response with the saintly women who looked up to him as their spiritual guide, sustained him by their wealth, and were his nearest friends all through life?

Cyprian, a deacon, who was to carry the answer back to Augustine, was leaving in three days, and therefore left insufficient time for the connected thought which the answer required.

I received [Jerome writes] the three letters, rather booklets, which you have had the kindness to send me by the deacon Cyprian. They contain, what you call *various questions*, what I feel to be *strictures* on my work. To answer these, if I so wished, would take the full bulk of a book. I shall try, however, so far as I can, to keep within the limits of a rather long letter, and not delay the brother (*Cyprian*), who came looking for letters three days only before he was to set out [for Africa]. I am constrained, therefore, to make this answer, not as one writing with mature thought, but as dictating in a hurry, with no time for thought. . . . I pass over the formalities of your greeting, by which you seek to quiet me ("quibus meum demulces caput"). I keep to myself the soothing words in which you try to make amends for blaming me. I come right to the point.

The first question refers to the title of Jerome's *List of Ecclesiastical Writers*. "Ergo hic liber," he says, "*De illustribus viris*, vel proprie *De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis* appellandus est." The second question, which is in fact the stricture of Augustine on the interpretation of the text Galat., 2: 11, is treated at great length. Jerome succeeds in saying that Augustine may be right, but his (Jerome's) meaning is not wrong. He enumerates the Greek commentators whom he has read on the subject, says that his work was the result of what he retained in memory of their reflections mingled with his own thoughts on the running text. He tells Augustine that he

should have known this from the preface of the book, where he states that he will not stand sponsor for other men's opinions. Moreover, Augustine, he says, should have gone to the sources indicated in the preface; there he would have found whether an opinion or a statement was set down as Jerome's own, or the opinion or thought of someone else. Finally he says that the interpretation censured by Augustine is originally the interpretation of Origen, which was used afterward by other writers in answering the impious objections of Porphyry.

Jerome next, unconsciously, I think, passes on to another and a distinct problem. He doubles the difficulty. Instead of explaining, he shifts the burden, and asks Augustine to explain.

What were the particular and various reasons for observing the Mosaic ritual at one time, and again declaring against its binding force? The Council at Jerusalem decided that the rites of the Old Law were not obligatory (Acts 15). Why, therefore, did Saint Paul observe it in the case of Timothy (Acts 14: 3)? Why did he himself observe the law of the tonsure at Cenchrea (Acts 18: 18)? Why again did he observe the Law, and fulfil a vow in the Temple at Jerusalem, when he was taken prisoner by the Jews (Acts 21: 23 ff)?

In answer to a third request, which Augustine had made for a *critical* translation of the Bible, to show the difference between the Hebrew and the Septuagint texts, Jerome makes some very valuable observations about the inaccuracies of the Greek and Latin versions, and alludes twice incidentally to his own declining years. He had still sixteen years of life and active work before him when this letter was written in 404, but he lets us see that he feels the burden of age, and that he is still keenly sensitive to the wrong done by those letters of Augustine circulated in Italy. He draws an interesting contrast between the relative positions of Augustine and himself, and the opportunities of each to get a hearing before the world, and expresses his unwillingness to continue the controversy. While he does not hold Augustine responsible for the copying of those mischievous letters in Italy, he nowhere quite clears him of blame. If we may read between the lines, he leaves the impression that he thinks Augustine too busy with the affairs of his diocese for the serious critical study of any question, whether in the Bible or elsewhere.

Do not [he says] turn against me the people incapable of accurate judgment ("imperitorum plebeculam"). They venerate you as a bishop; they hear you preaching in the Church with the honor due to the priesthood. Me they will underrate, they will despise as a man in the last lines of life, worn out with age, living in a monastery, following the lowly pursuits of a country life. Find someone (else) whom you can teach and correct. The sound of your voice hardly reaches us, separated by such an expanse of land and sea: and letters, when you write them, may be received in Italy and Rome before they are brought to me, to whom they are directed. . . . I beg of you at the close of this letter, do not force an old man, long since a veteran, to leave his rest to take up again the profession of arms, to imperil his life. You, who are young, and in full order of the episcopate, teach your own people, and adorn the dwellings of Rome with the rich fruits of Africa. As to me, let it be enough for me to smile at you from a poor little corner of my monastery together with those who hear me, whom I teach.

Jerome, despite the forbidding tone of the closing words of this last letter, was yet looking for an answer; and in a short note written to Augustine, probably very soon after, he opens the way to a better understanding, and lets it be seen that he is not unwilling to put off the habit of picking flaws, and to correspond with Augustine's original design.

When I inquired eagerly of our good brother Firmus, how you were, I was pleased to hear that you are well ("Sospitem te laetus audiavi"). Then when I asked, and was expecting to have letters from you, he (Firmus) said that he had left Africa without your knowing it. Therefore I send you now by him (Firmus) the greeting which I owe you. Let him prove the particular affection which I have for you. I beg of you at the same time to pardon my sensitiveness, which long refused to write a reply, when I knew that you required an answer: and that answer is not so much my answer to you, as the response of cause for cause—"Nec ego tibi, sed causa causae respondit"—And if there is blame in the answer (I ask you to hear me patiently), there is more blame in provoking the answer. But let us have done with these bickerings. Let us be brothers; and henceforth let the letters which pass between us be not a ground of dispute, but the proof of charity.

He refers then to an episode occasioned by the mistranslation of the word *ivy* in Jonas 4: 9, of which Augustine had told him

in a former letter, and, acknowledging again the stinging character of his former replies; he asks for a fair judgment on them. "If a friend," he says, "who has come against me with a drawn sword is repelled at my manner of meeting him; then you [that friend], as you esteem friendship and justice, ought to reprehend, not my answer [in substance], but answer the charges made against you." (Epist. CXV).

Augustine had received this short note as well as the longer letter, CXII, when he wrote his next reply. He refers a second time in this letter to the unfortunate affair between Jerome and Ruffinus, deplores the breach of friendship, and expresses himself as somewhat disappointed at not finding the clear and definite assurance of pardon which he expected to find in Jerome's last letter. "*Verum illud malueram tuis nosse rescriptis, utrum mihi veniam, quam poposceram dederis.*" Then, with the perseverance of a saint, Augustine returns again, the fourth time, to the same old problem about the text of Saint Paul, Galat. 2: 11.

There is perhaps nowhere a better parallel to judge the relative strength and clearness of Jerome and Augustine than these two letters, CXII and CXVI. Instead of a direct answer to the question as to whether Saint Paul means what he says, and says what he means, or whether he is only making a feint to bluff the crowd, Jerome brings up the theory of a problem which the Church had long since settled in practice—Why did the Apostles, under any circumstances, allow the observance of the ritual of the Old Law, when it was surely obsolete in the fact of the New? What was the binding force, what the respect due to the Mosaic ritual in the early Christian communities? Jerome piles up difficulties which seem at first to obscure the main issue. It may appear to be a weak point in Jerome's polemics: but it proves also his power to take in at a glance the wider problems which the minor question about the text of Saint Paul must surely comprehend. Moreover, at the writing of this letter, Jerome has not yet learned the genius of the man to whom he is writing. The impressions which have come to him of Augustine have been hardly favorable. He has had no means as yet to gauge the mind and heart of the Bishop of an insignificant little see in Northern Africa, a man whose very elevation to the episcopate had been not in

accordance with the canons of the Church universal. We may hardly expect Jerome to have confidence in the man who had been represented to him as an ambitious young ecclesiastice, a schemer who was courting the applause of men by picking flaws in the past glories of a retired veteran. "Quod olim adolescentuli facere consueverunt, accusando illustres viros, suo nomini famam quaerere." (Epist. CII, n. 2).

The analysis, however, which Augustine makes of Jerome's accumulated difficulties in Epist. CXVI, n. 8, must have shown Jerome that he had been underrating his man, that, if this African Bishop had not had the advantage of training from youth in the traditions of the Church, he had at any rate brought into the Church a gifted mind and the power of expression which commands a hearing.

With this letter Augustine sent to Jerome his work of thirty-three books or treatises against Faustus the Manichean. These must have been a sufficient proof to Jerome that Augustine's experience with Manichean dualism had taught him to take a right view of the one divine religion revealed and recorded in the books of the Old and the New Law: that he had learned, in rejecting the errors which troubled his earlier life, how to look at the divine order of human history, the *carmen saeculorum*,⁷ which ranges the past and future of human life round the one central fact of the Incarnation, the sacred human life of the Saviour.

We have no reply to this letter (CXVI) extant in the collected correspondence between Jerome and Augustine. But from a letter which Jerome addressed to Marcellinus, a layman in Africa, a few years later, it is evident that the unfortunate controversy is ended, and that Jerome has now full confidence and trust in the sincerity of Augustine and the orthodoxy of his views on questions of Christian philosophy. Marcellinus had written to Jerome for the solution of some problems, among others the origin of the human soul. Jerome answers that he has given this question some consideration in his work against Ruffinus. But he says: "Surely you have there (in Africa) a man of holy life and learned, Augustine the Bishop, who can teach you with the living voice, as they

⁷ De Civit. Dei, Lib. XI, c. 18; cf. Confess., Lib. III, c. 7.

say; who will explain to you his own thought on the subject; even more, through him you will have my judgment".⁸

F. E. TOURSCHER, O.S.A.

Villanova, Pa.

THE NEW CODEX OF CANON LAW.

II. De Rebus.

IN Canon Law everything that does not properly belong to some other division of the subject is treated under the caption *res*. This section of the new Code embraces 146 pages, which in turn are made up of 826 canons. This third book of the Code, which is of the utmost practical importance, opens with the definition and divisions of the term *res*. After three canons on *simony* and six on the *Sacraments* in general, each Sacrament is taken up separately. A second part is devoted to sacred places, divine cult, preaching, teaching, seminaries, schools, ecclesiastical benefices, and temporal goods. In the present article attention will be directed to some of the more essential regulations on these topics.

BAPTISM.

Deacons, although they are extraordinary ministers of this Sacrament, should not baptize without permission of the Ordinary or pastor. This permission will not be granted without sufficient cause, though, in case of necessity, it may be presumed. In private baptism two *witnesses*, or at least one, if possible, must be present so that proof of the Sacrament having been received may be available. The text here speaks of witnesses, not of sponsors. A person may be qualified as a witness, and not as a sponsor. Sponsors, when present, will supply the place of other witnesses, though the text is silent on this point. The proposed baptism of adults is made known, when convenient, to the Ordinary, so that he or someone delegated by him may, if he so desire, confer the Sacrament in a more solemn manner (Can. 774). It is even fitting in metropolitan and cathedral churches that the baptism of adults, as was once the practice in the Church, take place on Holy Saturday or on the vigil of Pentecost (Can. 772).

⁸ Epist. ad Marcellinum et Anapsychiam, CXXVI, n. 1.

Theological principles concerning those who may or should be baptized are repeated in the Code, while Canon 753 declares that ordinarily an adult, immediately after his baptism, should assist at Mass and receive Holy Communion. This will explain the second paragraph of the same Canon, according to which it is proper that the priest baptizing, as well as the adult in good health, whom he baptizes, should be fasting. The term *adult* throughout this matter is used in its liturgical sense, in contradistinction to *infant*, and signifies ordinarily any person over seven years of age. General law (Can. 755) now concedes what before was sometimes granted by special indult, since the Ordinary may for a serious reasonable cause permit an adult to be baptized according to the form that is used in the baptism of infants. It is not within the power of the Ordinary to permit a *private* baptism, except in the case of adult heretics who are baptized conditionally. This last concession, which refers to converts to the Church, and which had at times in the past been granted by special indult, now becomes universal. Solemn baptism should, of course, as a rule be administered in the church. The Ordinary may nevertheless in an extraordinary case, where there is a just and reasonable cause, allow in private houses the administration of this Sacrament with all the ceremonies of the Ritual (Can. 776 § 2). A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, issued 17 January, 1914, had settled this question.

The Code naturally demands the presence of one sponsor, if possible ("quatenus fieri possit"), at the solemn administration of baptism, limiting the number of sponsors in each case to two, one of each sex. The Code is at variance with the opinion of theologians in regard to a sponsor at *private* baptism. A sponsor is required even at the private administration by a lay person of this Sacrament, if one is easily obtainable ("si facile haberi queat"). If no sponsor is present at the baptism privately administered, one is required later when the prescribed ceremonies are supplied in the church. In this latter case, however, since the Sacrament is not actually administered, the sponsor does not contract any spiritual relationship (Can. 762). If for any reason the Sacrament is readministered conditionally, the same sponsor as before, if possible, should be present; otherwise none is required. If the

same sponsor acts in both cases, he contracts a spiritual relationship with the person baptized. When one person acts as sponsor at the first administration of the Sacrament, and another when baptism is later conferred conditionally, neither contracts any spiritual relationship (Can. 763). A sponsor in baptism should ordinarily be at least fourteen years of age. To act in this capacity a cleric in Major Orders needs the express consent of his Ordinary. Religious too of either sex are acceptable in case of necessity only, and then only with the permission of their superior. There is no longer any spiritual relationship arising in baptism between the parents of the one baptized and the minister of the Sacrament or the sponsors (Can. 768).

A parish priest is the qualified registrar of his parochial records. As the decree *Ne temere* demanded that the pastor *manu sua* write his own matrimonial records, even though not assisting personally at the marriage, so now the present Code, though not expressing this point quite so clearly, seems to impose the same personal obligation regarding the baptismal registry. We quote in full Canon 777:

§ 1: Parochi debent nomina baptizatorum, mentione facta de ministro, parentibus ac patrinis, de loco ac de die collati baptismi, in baptismali libro sedulo et sine ulla mora referre.

§ 2: Ubi vero de illegitimis filiis agatur, matris nomen est inserendum, si publice ejus maternitas constet, vel ipsa sponte sua scripto vel coram duobus testibus id petat; item nomen patris, dummodo ipse sponte sua a parrocho vel scripto vel coram duobus testibus id requirat, vel ex publico authentico documento sit notus; in ceteris casibus inscribatur natus tanquam filius patris ignoti vel ignotorum parentum.

Thus does the second paragraph put an end to another vexed question.

When a person is baptized outside his own parish or in the absence of his pastor, said pastor should be notified without delay. The chief reason of this legislation, though the text (Can. 778) does not mention it, is, we judge, that the necessary record may be kept; as a baptismal certificate would naturally be sought in one's own parish. Where the rights of another are not at stake, the testimony of one worthy witness

should be accepted in proof that a person has been baptized; the oath too of one who has been baptized in adult age will be sufficient in like circumstances in proof of his or her own baptism (Can. 779).

CONFIRMATION.

This Sacrament need not long detain us. A bishop must see that confirmation is administered at least every five years in the various parishes of his diocese. If he is negligent in the performance of this duty, it devolves upon the archbishop to report the matter to the Holy See (Can. 274, § 4). It is recommended that this Sacrament should not as a rule be administered in the Latin Church to children under seven years of age. Nevertheless younger children may be confirmed, if in danger of death, or when for other serious and just reasons the bishop sees fit to administer the Sacrament (Can. 778). Each person confirmed should have a sponsor, if possible, and one only. A sponsor may act for one or at most two, unless the prelate who is confirming for just reasons decide otherwise (Can. 794). As a rule the same individual ought not to fulfill the office of sponsor for the same person in both Baptism and Confirmation. This however is allowed when Baptism is followed immediately by Confirmation, or in other cases when the bishop confirming permits it for sufficient reason (Can. 796).

The record of the Confirmation, which the pastor must enter in the book set aside for that purpose, will contain all necessary details, that is, the names of those confirmed, of their parents and sponsors, of the bishop officiating, the place and date of the service. A further entry, as we have said before, in the baptismal registry will indicate that the person in question has been confirmed. It is incumbent on the bishop or other minister of the Sacrament to see that a pastor, when not present at the Confirmation of his subject, is duly notified of the same. What was said above concerning the proof required to show that one has been baptized is likewise applicable in Confirmation.

THE BLESSED SACRAMENT.

Priests who wish to say Mass in churches to which they are not attached should ordinarily be permitted to do so, when they

present proper credentials. These for priests of a rite other than the Latin should come from the Congregation for Oriental Affairs. "Si iis litteris careat (sacerdos extraneus) sed rectori ecclesiae de ejus probitate apprime constet, poterit admitti; si vero rectori sit ignotus, admitti adhuc potest semel vel bis, dummodo, ecclesiastica veste indutus, nihil ex celebratione ab ecclesia, in qua litat, quovis titulo percipiat, *et nomen officium suamque dioecesim in peculiari libro signet*" (Can. 804, § 2). This registration of priests in churches where they celebrate has hitherto been in vogue in Rome and elsewhere. Bishops of course may continue to make their own more stringent regulations in regard to strangers saying Mass in their dioceses. We shall quote only one of the twenty-one canons on stipends: "Qui habent Missarum numerum de quibus sibi liceat libere disponere, possunt eas tribuere sacerdotibus sibi acceptis, dummodo probe sibi constet eos esse omni exceptione majores vel testimonio proprii Ordinarii commendatos" (Can. 838). Permission then is no longer absolutely required to send Masses to priests in other dioceses.

The text is careful to state that any priest, "*si privatim celebrat,*" may distribute Holy Communion immediately before or after Mass. The prohibition consequently of giving Holy Communion immediately before or after a High Mass or a collegiate Mass still obtains. The regulations for first Holy Communion make no mention of the specific age required and are in part worded as follows: "*In periculo mortis, ut sanctissima Eucharistia pueris ministrari possit ac debeat, satis est ut sciant Corpus Christi a communi cibo discernere illudque reverenter adorare. Extra mortis periculum plenior cognitio doctrinae christianae et accuratio praeparatio merito exigitur, ea scilicet, qua ipsi fidei saltem mysteria necessaria necessitate medii ad salutem pro suo captu percipiant, et devote pro suae aetatis modulo ad Sanctissimam Eucharistiam accedant*" (Can. 854). While nothing is here stated specifically concerning the age required for first Communion, Canon 859 decrees that every one who has reached *the years of discretion, that is, the use of reason*, must observe the Easter precept. The distinction between those who dwell in a house where the Blessed Sacrament is reserved and others, in regard to receiving Holy Communion when ill and not fasting, was based on the con-

venience of priests rather than on the spiritual needs of the faithful. Rightly then, under the conditions and circumstances laid down by the Sacred Congregation of the Council in 1906 and 1907, Holy Communion may be administered once or twice a week, and not merely once or twice a month as formerly.

The period allotted for the fulfilling of the Easter precept extends now as before over two weeks only, namely from Palm Sunday to Low Sunday inclusive. Ordinaries nevertheless may without special indult, if circumstances require it, permit the Easter Communion any time from the fourth Sunday of Lent to Trinity Sunday inclusive. The special concession granted to the United States by Pope Pius VIII by which the time appointed extends from the First Sunday of Lent to Trinity Sunday has not been withdrawn, and consequently remains in force. Individual bishops possibly, following the instructions of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore (No. 257), may be tempted to curtail this period in keeping with the general indult granted in the new Code.

Practice had considerably modified the rigors of the old discipline of receiving Communion at Easter time in one's own parish. The present Code merely demands that Catholics be counseled ("suadendum") to make their Easter duty in their own parish, and that if they fulfill this duty elsewhere they should notify their own pastor of the fact (Can. 859). Former decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, the last of 28 April, 1914, relating to Communion on Holy Saturday, have been somewhat modified, since the distribution of the Blessed Eucharist on that day is now permitted during the Mass or immediately after, but not otherwise (Can. 867, § 3).

PENANCE.

For *validity* as well as *licitness*, all particular laws or privileges to the contrary notwithstanding, special faculties are required to hear the confessions of religious or novices of any community whatsoever (Can. 876). This law nevertheless does not apply to a confessor who absolves religious in a church or in a public or semi-public oratory (Can. 522). Religious too who are seriously ill, though not in immediate danger of death, may during the continuance of this grave illness con-

fess as often as desired to a confessor who is approved for women's confessions, though he has not been granted special faculties for Religious. A confessor's fitness is to be tested by an examination, unless his knowledge of theology is otherwise evident. Even pastors may be reëxamined if their qualifications for the office of a confessor are later doubted. Bishops or others are counseled not to withdraw or suspend faculties without strong reasons. Any confessor who has *ordinary*, and not merely delegated, *jurisdiction* or power of absolving, may absolve his own subjects anywhere throughout the world. This will apply henceforth to pastors of the United States. The prescriptions of the decree promulgated by the Holy Office on 13 July, 1916, in regard to the reservation of sins are repeated in the Code.

In the chapter on indulgences we note that not only may bishops without special indult grant the Papal Blessing, with plenary indulgence attached, on Easter and on one other great feast of their own choosing during the year, but this they may do when not actually pontificating, but merely assisting. Prelates *nullius*, vicars and prefects apostolic, even though not bishops, may do the same on Easter only.

When a visit to a church is prescribed as a condition for gaining an indulgence, it may be made any time from noon of the day preceding to midnight of the day itself to which the indulgence is attached. Confession, if made within the eight days that immediately precede the day of indulgence will suffice, while Holy Communion may be received the day before. Moreover, confession and Communion will be sufficient, if not deferred beyond the octave of the day fixed for the indulgence. Subsequent confession and Communion during a like period of eight days after the completion of the exercises will suffice for gaining indulgences that are granted during triduums, missions, etc. Those who are accustomed, unless prevented for sufficient cause, to go to confession at least twice a month, or who are wont, while in the state of grace, to receive daily, though they may miss Holy Communion once or twice a week, may gain all indulgences, except those pertaining to jubilees, without a special confession.

EXTREME UNCTION.

This Sacrament should be administered conditionally when it is doubtful whether the patient has attained the use of reason, or is actually in danger of death, or is still alive. The anointing of the feet may be omitted for any reasonable cause. The anointing of the forehead with the prescribed short form suffices in case of necessity. There is an obligation nevertheless, if time permit, of supplying all the usual anointings (Can. 947), and indeed not conditionally, but absolutely (Holy Office, 9 March, 1917). That all the prayers omitted must likewise be supplied cannot be questioned, since the Ritual (Tit. V, cap. 1, n. 10) insists on it.

ORDERS.

Ordinarily a bishop may promote to orders his own subjects only. Subjects in this matter are determined by the possession of a domicile in the diocese *una cum origine* or by domicile only, namely domicile *sine origine*. In this latter case an oath to the effect that he intends to remain perpetually in the diocese is required of the candidate for orders, unless incardination through the reception of tonsure has already been effected. This is one of the few cases in law of informal, or presumptive incardination (Cann. 111, 956); another, "*ratione beneficii residentialis*," is found in Canon 114. A bishop nevertheless may promote to orders without such oath his own subjects who are later to be canonically excardinated and properly received into another diocese. Naturally a promise under oath of perpetual service in a diocese is not demanded before ordination of professed religious. Vicars and prefects, apostolic, as well as abbots or prelates *nullius*, if they possess the episcopal character, are placed on an equality with diocesan bishops in all that pertains to ordination. Lacking episcopal consecration, they may nevertheless in their own territory confer tonsure and minor orders not only on their own subjects, but also on others as well who are properly presented. Outside the territory which is subject to them the ordination by them of even their own subjects would be invalid. After the lapse of a year from the date that the diocese becomes vacant, the vicar capitular requires the consent of the cathedral chapter to permit candidates to receive orders. It would appear then that

our administrators of vacant dioceses require the consent or majority vote of the diocesan consultors in like circumstances. Within the first year of the vacancy the vicar capitular may promote not only those who are obliged to accept orders by reason of a benefice, which they have received or are about to receive, but likewise anyone else who is destined for some particular office, which, owing to the needs of the diocese, must be filled without delay. As this legislation applies to all administrators of vacant sees, more extended powers will be enjoyed in the United States in this matter than formerly. The vicar capitular or administrator is not permitted to concede ordination to one whom the bishop of the diocese has previously rejected. Letters containing permission to receive orders do not lose their force at the death of the one who granted them, or owing to the cessation in any way of his jurisdiction. Such letters, of course, may be revoked.

Candidates for the priesthood should spend at least their theological course in a seminary. Only in peculiar cases for grave reasons, which are binding in conscience on the Ordinary, may he dispense from this regulation. A student who is thus exempt from seminary discipline must be subjected to the watchful care and discipline of a pious and competent priest. The age prescribed for major orders, or for the episcopate, has not been changed. Tonsure is not to be given before the candidate has begun his theological course, subdeaconship not earlier than toward the end of the third year of theology, deaconship not earlier than the beginning of the fourth and priesthood after the middle of the fourth year of theology. Moreover these studies may not be made privately, but in an institution organized for that purpose, and possessing the prescribed course of studies (Cann. 976, 1365).

No matter what custom to the contrary may have existed, tonsure and a minor order, or all four minor orders, or a minor order and subdeaconship must not be conferred on the same day without special permission of the Holy See. Thus the local legislation of the city of Rome has been extended to the universal Church. It is unnecessary to insist on the fact that the reception of two major orders on the same day is impossible. While it is left to the bishop or other Ordinary to determine the period that should elapse between tonsure and

the first minor order, and between one minor order and another, a year, either civic or ecclesiastical, must transpire between the last minor order, that of acolyte, and subdeaconship, three months at least between subdeaconship and deaconship, or between deaconship and priesthood, unless in the judgment of the Ordinary shorter terms are needful or beneficial to the Church. Practically, therefore, the bishop determines the time that should elapse between the various orders, since no special indult is required to shorten the periods prescribed. When the *title* of ordination is lost, another must be acquired, unless suitable support in the opinion of the bishop is otherwise provided for. The title *servitii ecclesiae* is granted by general law, where no canonical title is available, except in countries that are subject to the Congregation of the Propaganda. These retain the title *missionis*.

Among the various hindrances to the reception or exercise of orders, known as *irregularities*, we find that *ex defectu* any one is irregular who is infamous *infamia juris*—a judge who has passed sentence of death, one who has accepted the office of public executioner, as well as his voluntary and immediate assistants in the execution of a death sentence. Among others those are irregular *ex delicto* who attempt marriage or merely go through a civil matrimonial contract, while they themselves are bound by lawful wedlock, or major orders, or even simple and temporary religious vows, or who enter into an alliance with a woman who is lawfully married or is under religious vows. An attempt at suicide begets an irregularity, while clerics who in practising medicine or surgery without permission lose a patient by death likewise incur an irregularity. To allow oneself, except in extreme necessity, to be baptized by a non-Catholic is forbidden under pain of incurring an irregularity. This is the only irregularity now arising from baptism. Clerics still incur an irregularity by exercising an act pertaining to a major order which they do not possess or the performance of which is forbidden to them by reason of any penalty, whether corrective or strictly punitive, a personal or local interdict. All other irregularities remain practically the same, except that some are now styled mere prohibitions or impediments. Thus, sons of non-Catholics, while their parents remain outside the Church, married men, those who conduct

certain affairs of trust, until they are free from such matters, slaves strictly so-called, those who are subject to military service, until said service has been completed, converts till the bishop is satisfied that they have been sufficiently tried, those whose reputation is bad *infamia facti*, as long as in the judgment of the Ordinary this state continues; are prohibited from receiving orders. Irregularities or prohibitions, which are never effected by ignorance of their existence, are multiplied when they rise from different causes, or from repeated voluntary homicide, not otherwise. In a petition for a dispensation in this matter all irregularities and impediments to which the petitioner is subject must be mentioned. Where silence however is due to an oversight or ignorance, a general dispensation will remove all irregularities and impediments, except those that rise from voluntary homicide, and those which have been submitted to a judicial forum. When one or other irregularity or impediment is omitted in the petition intentionally or through bad faith, the dispensation granted is valueless.

Testimonial letters for the period preceding puberty are not exacted by the law. Whether the prescriptions of the Sacred Plenary Council of Baltimore (No. 321), which demand testimonial letters, in a broad sense, from the bishop of one's origin or place of birth, though the candidate has left the diocese before the age of puberty, are still in force, we hesitate to declare, though we believe not. Where under certain circumstances specified in the text of Canon 994 it is impossible or too difficult to secure all the required testimonial letters, the Ordinary may accept instead the sworn statement of the candidate. That a parishioner is about to receive a major order must be announced once to the congregation at a Mass of precept or at some other function that is frequented by the people, unless the Ordinary in his prudence, for just cause, dispense from this regulation. The law is not applicable to religious of perpetual vows, whether solemn or simple. The Ordinary may, if advisable, prescribe that the announcement be made in other churches also, or he may have recourse at all times, instead of an announcement in the church, to a public notice or bulletin at the entrance to the church. It will be sufficient to leave this proclamation in place for a few days only, but a Sunday or holiday of obligation must intervene.

This legislation, as we shall see, approaches that which is now in vogue in regard to matrimonial banns. Unless the Ordinary decide otherwise, the announcement should be repeated, if the ordination is deferred beyond six months. The apparent purpose of this legislation, which is based on the Council of Trent (Sess. 23, cap. 5 de ref.), but which in many places had not been insisted on, is to remind the faithful of their obligation in conscience of divulging any canonical reason known to them why the candidate should not be advanced to orders.

A retreat is required for orders: three full days for tonsure, or minor orders, and at least six for a major order. When one receives more than one major order within six months, however, a retreat of three full days may, if the Ordinary so decide, suffice for deaconship. Would that the law were a little more specific! What is to be done when a candidate is to receive all three major orders within a few days, as prevailing conditions with us seem not infrequently to demand? Our bishops and seminary authorities would wish at least that a retreat of six days might answer, priesthood being conferred at the end of the period, and the other orders during the retreat. Possibly the Holy See may still be indulgent in this and similar matters. Regular ordination days are retained, yet a bishop may for serious reason confer major orders on any Sunday or holiday, while minor orders may be given also on *doubles*. Any practice to the contrary is blameworthy (Can. 1006). What concessions may still be granted to our bishops in this matter is problematical. A special book in the chancery office will contain a record with all necessary details of the ordinations that take place in the diocese. All documents pertaining to ordination ought likewise to be carefully preserved. A certificate of ordination must be given to each one promoted, who when ordained elsewhere should present this document at his own diocesan chancery, that the necessary data for the prescribed record may be at hand. Furthermore the reception of sub-deaconship is made known to the pastor of the church where the newly ordained was baptized, that the fact may be duly noted also in the baptismal registry.

MARRIAGE.

The regulations prescribed by the constitution *Ne temere* are, with a few minor changes, repeated in the Code. It is

declared that any promise of marriage whatever is invalid *in utroque foro*, unless it is made in writing with the formalities prescribed. Moreover, even when without any legitimate reason one of the parties to valid espousals refuses to marry, no juridical action or suit tending to the fulfillment of the matrimonial contract is permissible, but merely a petition for reimbursement for any damages that may have been sustained (Can. 1017). When on account of the serious illness of one of the parties it is impossible to observe all the preliminaries demanded by the law, it will suffice ordinarily to have the parties concerned declare under oath that they are baptized and also free from canonical matrimonial impediments. The Sacrament of Confirmation, if it can be done without too much inconvenience, ought to be conferred before marriage on those who have not received it.

The banns are obligatory. A substitute for the proclamation of the banns in the church is a publication of them in a bulletin, at the doors of the edifice, containing the names of the persons who are about to marry. This public announcement must be left in place for at least eight days. The period will necessarily comprise two days on which the faithful are obliged to hear Mass, that they may have ample opportunity of seeing the notice. This regime was inaugurated some nine years ago when the Archbishop of Paris obtained a similar concession on account of the vast number of marriages in the large parishes of his diocese. The basis of the petition was the length of time consumed in reading the names in the church and the consequent tediousness to the listeners, who were for the most part unacquainted with the contracting parties. The indulgence which was conceded to Paris was restricted to parishes of 10,000 or more souls, and required that the proclamation be affixed to the doors of the parish church on three successive Sundays or holidays. The present general law is considerably broader. Civil authorities in some countries had much earlier resorted to similar public announcements of proposed matrimonial contracts. In mixed marriages the banns are not published, except with the Ordinary's permission, and then without any mention of the religion of the non-Catholic party. This is not new legislation, as various decrees to the same effect had been previously issued. Not infrequently the publication of the

banns is required not merely in different parishes, but likewise in different dioceses. An Ordinary may dispense from the publishing of the banns in other dioceses, as well as in his own, when the parties are of different dioceses. It belongs to the bishop of one or the other spouse in whose diocese the marriage occurs to grant the dispensation. The bishop of either party may grant the required dispensation, if the marriage takes place outside the territory of both. When parents do not know of the proposed marriage of their children under twenty-one years of age or are reasonably opposed to the marriage, the pastor will not proceed before submitting the case to the Ordinary.

In the chapter on impediments we are told that a public impediment is one the existence of which can be established in the external forum; otherwise the impediment is secret. Some impediments are styled *gradus minoris*, others *gradus majoris*. This distinction owes its origin to the reorganization of the Roman Curia by the constitution *Sapienti consilio* and the subsequent rules which were established for the guidance of the Congregation of the Sacraments. The difference between impediments and dispensation of *less* and *greater degree* is applicable especially when the petition for a dispensation is faulty or defective because of falsehood or suppression of the truth. Thus; Canon 1054 says: "Dispensatio a *minore* impedimento concessa nullo sive obreptionis [falsehood] sive subreptionis [suppression of the truth] vitio irritatur, etsi *unica causa* finalis in precibus exposita *falsa* fuerit."

Canon 1043 is here submitted in its entirety, since it embodies the contents of various former decrees, with the addition also of a point that was under discussion in regard to dispensing *urgente mortis periculo* from the presence at marriage of witnesses:

Urgente mortis periculo, locorum Ordinarii, ad consulendum conscientiae et, si casus ferat, legitimationi prolis, possunt tum super forma in matrimonii celebratione servanda, tum super omnibus et singulis impedimentis juris ecclesiastici, sive publicis sive occultis, etiam multiplicibus, exceptis impedimentis provenientibus ex sacro presbyteratus ordine et ex affinitate in linea recta, consummato matrimonio, dispensare proprios subditos ubique commorantes et omnes in proprio territorio actu degentes, remoto scandalo, et si dispensatio

concedatur super cultus disparitate aut mixta religione, praestitis consuetis cautionibus.

A slight change in the wording of the text, in regard to affinity, from the previous similar legislation, rendered necessary by the present meaning of the term affinity, will be noted. What is conceded in this Canon to Ordinaries is extended in the next article in precisely the same circumstances, to pastors, and likewise to other priests who within the prescriptions of the law assist at such marriages, but only when the Ordinary can not be approached. A confessor also, under the same circumstances and conditions, enjoys the same power in sacramental confession, but the dispensation thus granted is valid in the internal forum only. Canon 1049 grants certain powers of dispensing where two or more impediments affect the same person. For this formerly a special indult was necessary in most cases. Another article (1052) clears up a point which was under discussion, and also makes a new grant: "Dispensatio ab impedimento consanguinitatis vel affinitatis, concessa in aliquo impedimenti gradu, valet, licet in petitione vel in concessione *error* circa gradum irrepserit, dummodo gradus revera existens sit inferior [*remotior* might be clearer], aut licet reticium fuerit aliud impedimentum ejusdem speciei in aequali vel inferiori gradu." Some few other considerations, not so essential, concerning matrimonial dispensations, are omitted in the present article.

Any non-Catholic ceremony whatsoever in connexion with a mixed marriage, or any appearance before a minister before or after the Catholic ceremony, is prohibited. The second paragraph of the same Canon (1063) repeats former decrees for the guidance of the pastor who is asked to assist at the marriage of one who has lost the faith, or who has joined a prohibited society, or who refuses to go to confession.

The age of legitimate consent to marriage has been raised to sixteen for the male and fourteen for the female. The exception, "unless precociousness supply the defect of age" ("nisi malitia supplet aetatem") has been abrogated. The impediment *raptus* has been somewhat changed, since either the abduction or the forcible retention of a woman for the purpose of marriage begets this impediment. Affinity, which now

arises solely from a valid marriage, prohibits marriage in all degrees in the direct line, in the first and second degrees only in the transverse or indirect line. Public decency ("honestas publica") arises from an *invalid* marriage ("oritur ex matrimonio invalido sive consummato sive non"), and likewise from public and notorious concubinage. It renders marriage null in the direct line only, and then in the first and second degrees, between either party and the blood relations of the other. Spiritual relationship begets a diriment impediment in Baptism only (not in Confirmation), and even here it is not as comprehensive as before, since the parents of the one baptized no longer contract an impediment with the one who administers the Sacrament or with the sponsors. Canonical *legal* relationship or adoption will hereafter follow the civil law of the various countries, rendering a matrimonial contract merely illicit or also invalid, as it is illicit or null according to the civil laws of the country in question (Cann. 1059, 1080).

We append the first paragraph of Canon 1070, which we believe constitutes one of the most important decrees of the entire Code: "Nullum est matrimonium contractum a persona non baptizata cum persona *baptizata in Ecclesia catholica* vel ad eandem ex haeresi aut schismate conversa." While thus far no commentary on this text has appeared, it is apparent that this canon distinguishes between a baptism conferred in the Catholic Church and a baptism that takes place outside the Church, or in other words, between a Catholic and a non-Catholic baptism. The Church is legislating for Catholics only. The marriage of non-Catholics *inter se* is not affected apparently by the baptism of the contracting parties. Two unbaptized persons, or two baptized non-Catholics contract marriage validly. Arguing *e contrario* from Canon 1070, the conclusion forces itself upon us that the marriage of non-Catholics, of whom one is baptized while the other is not baptized, is likewise valid. This view is strengthened somewhat by Canon 1119, which puts "matrimonium non consummatum inter partem baptizatam et partem non baptizatam" on an equality, as far as being dissolved by papal dispensation or solemn religious profession is concerned. There is question here of a *valid* contract between a baptized and an unbaptized person. The law apparently refers to *all such valid contracts*, whether

it is a case of a Catholic who has married with a proper dispensation, or of two non-Catholics. In this latter case Canon 1119 would be applicable if one of the parties later became a Catholic. If the above interpretation of Canon 1090 is correct, it puts an end to much work and worry for diocesan matrimonial courts, especially in the United States. If the marriage of non-Catholics is valid, even though one of the parties be baptized and the other not baptized, such contract of course will remain valid and any matrimonial entanglement later of either husband or wife with a Catholic will be incapable of adjustment during the lifetime of the other consort.

The impediments of error, fear, and servitude or condition remain in force, though they have been placed in the text under the requisites for matrimonial *consent*. Other impediments, which we have not mentioned, remain as before. Matrimonial consent must be expressed in words. Equivalent signs are not sufficient, if the party contracting is capable of speech. The effect of conditional consent is clearly set forth in Canon 1092. General delegated authority to assist at a marriage cannot be given, under pain of nullity, except to assistants in the parish. The priest, as well as the particular marriage at which he is delegated to assist, must be definitely determined (Can. 1096). A marriage will be contracted in the presence of the woman's pastor, unless a sufficient cause determine otherwise. Where Catholics are of different rites, their marriage will take place in the presence of the pastor of the husband, and according to his rite, except there be some particular law to the contrary. When one of the parties to a marriage is in danger of death, and it is impossible or extremely difficult to summon a duly authorized priest, the marriage will be valid as well as licit, if contracted in the presence of two witnesses; at the same time, any priest available should be present.

There are four canons in the Code concerning *marriages of conscience* or secret marriages, which may be passed over as not of great importance. There is no season of the year that excludes marriage. The solemnization of marriages is practically reduced to the solemn nuptial blessing, which is found in the Mass *pro sponsis*. The periods during which this blessing is prohibited, have been shortened, extending now from the first Sunday of Advent to Christmas inclusive, and from Ash

Wednesday to Easter inclusive. Ordinaries may nevertheless for sufficient reason permit this solemn blessing, even during these closed periods, when liturgical rules do not interfere (Can. 1108). Mixed marriages should not take place in Catholic churches or with Catholic rites. Ordinaries may however, but only in extreme cases, especially to avoid greater evils, allow the celebration of a mixed marriage in a church, with some one of the usual ecclesiastical rites, but never with Mass (Cann. 1102, 1109).

The dissolving of the marriage tie by papal dispensation, by religious profession, or by reason of the Pauline Privilege, the separation of husband and wife "*quoad torum, mensam et habitationem*" for reasons laid down in canon law, the requisites for rendering effective an invalid matrimonial contract, and other necessary matters, are stated in the Code clearly, though concisely. A decree of the Holy Office, on 2 March, 1904, which had escaped many, declared that a *sanatio in radice* was impossible when the nullity of the marriage was due to an impediment arising from the divine or the natural law. The Holy Office took up this question *ex professo*, and its decree prevailed over some decisions to the contrary that emanated from the Sacred Penitentiary. Canonists understood consequently that a *sanatio* could not be effected, even from the moment that an impediment, which is based on the divine or natural law, ceased to exist. This opinion is confirmed now by the Code, which says of *such* marriages: "*Ecclesia non sanat in radice, ne a momento quidem cessationis impedimenti*" (Can. 1139, § 2).

CONCLUSION.

A bishop may in certain specified circumstances convert a church to profane, though not sordid, uses (Can. 1187). "*Effusio seminis humani in ipsa*" is no longer given among the causes that violate a church, but another is added: "*impiis vel sordidis usibus, quibus ecclesia addicta fuerit.*" The violation of a church does not carry with it the profanation of the cemetery adjoining; neither does the violation of a cemetery affect a church which is situated nearby. The laws regarding the loss of consecration of an altar or altar-stone, chalice and paten, are somewhat more lenient than before. The titular of

a non-permanent altar ("altaris mobilis aut non fixi") may be changed with the consent of the Ordinary; which is not true of the titular or patron of a church or fixed altar. Parish churches must keep a record of deaths, giving the name and parents or consort (husband or wife) of the deceased, the Sacraments received before death, place and date of burial (Can. 1238). The holidays of obligation of the Latin Church are Christmas, Circumcision, Epiphany, Ascension, Corpus Christi, Immaculate Conception, Assumption, the feast of St. Joseph, of SS. Peter and Paul, and All Saints' Day. Where however any of these days of precept has been legitimately abrogated or transferred, it cannot be reinstated without consulting the Holy See (Can. 1247). And what is to be done in countries where one of these days was never observed as a holiday of obligation? The Code says nothing further. There is no prohibition (the law is already in force)* to partake of both fish and flesh meat at the same meal, while the law both of fasting and abstinence ceases after midday ("post meridiem") on Holy Saturday. The Code is silent in regard to all fasting in Advent, except on the Ember Days and Christmas Eve. The fast or abstinence of vigils is not anticipated. If the vigils fall on Sundays or holidays, all fasting or abstinence is abrogated. All who have reached the age of seven years are obliged to abstain, while the law of fasting affects all of either sex who are between the twenty-first (completed) and sixtieth year (commenced). Ordinaries may, without special indult, permit the reservation of the Blessed Eucharist in collegiate churches, and in the principal chapel, whether public or semi-public, of ecclesiastical colleges, religious houses, asylums, hospitals, and similar institutions. The old law which permitted the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament only in cathedrals, parochial churches, and churches of religious, necessitated special indults, in order that our convents and other institutions might habitually possess the Blessed Eucharist. The necessity of renewing these indults every five, or for some institutions every seven years, was annoying. The present concession, long desired, will prove most welcome. The Blessed Sacrament may be removed from the tabernacle for the night to a safer place, if there be a serious reason, ap-

* See p. 541 of this number.

proved by the Ordinary, for so doing; in which case liturgical laws in regard to the use of a corporal, light, etc. must be observed. It is prescribed that the Benediction Host and Sacred Particles be changed *frequently*. Sacred vessels and linens ought not to be handled except by clerics or by those in whose custody they are (Can. 1306). The regulations of Pius X concerning catechizing and preaching, as well as the recent constitution of Benedict XV on preaching, are given in the Code. Missions in parochial churches are prescribed at least every ten years. The regents of seminaries ("deputati") hold office for six years, may be reëlected, and are not removable except for serious reason. Each committee ("coetus deputatorum, alter pro disciplina, alter pro administratione bonorum temporalium") is made up of two priests, chosen by the bishop with the advice of the cathedral chapter or diocesan consultors. Certain ones, for instance the vicar general, the rector or procurator or ordinary confessors of the seminary, are not qualified for this office. Details are given in regard to the tax, and method of levying it, for the maintenance of diocesan seminaries. The text insists on a course of at least two full years in Philosophy and four in Theology. At least each of the branches of Sacred Scripture, Dogmatic Theology, Moral Theology, and Ecclesiastical History requires its own distinct professor. Catholic children are forbidden to attend neutral or mixed schools. The Ordinary *alone* is to judge, in keeping with various instructions of the Holy See, in what circumstances and under what safeguards against perversion, such attendance may be tolerated.

Permission to publish books may be given by the author's Ordinary, or by the Ordinary either of the place where the book is *published* or of the place where it is *printed*. If any of these refuse an imprimatur, this fact must be made known to either of the others who is approached for permission to publish the book in question (Can. 1385, § 2). When however a superior finds it inadvisable to allow the publication of a book, he should on request, unless grave motives militate against it, make known his reasons to the author (Can. 1394, § 2). Clerics need permission to publish books even on profane subjects, or even to contribute articles to newspapers, periodicals, or reviews, religious or secular. Diocesan consultors, when

assuming office, must make the prescribed profession of faith before the Ordinary or his delegate and the other consultors. Professors of Theology, Canon Law, and Philosophy in seminaries need not necessarily repeat the profession of faith at the beginning of each scholastic year.

Our new legislation has eighty canons concerning ecclesiastical benefices, a half dozen on hospitals, asylums and similar institutions, and fifty-seven in regard to temporal goods. These last contain some interesting details in regard to *prescription*. A board, comprising the bishop as president and at least two others, chosen with the advice of the cathedral chapter, is prescribed for the administration of temporal goods, "*nisi jure vel consuetudine peculiari jam alio aequivalenti modo legitime fuerit provisum*" (Can. 1520). Some modifications of former canons, relating especially to the values involved, have been introduced in relation to *alienation* of church property. These will have little practical application in the United States because of our special indult in this matter. When the divine law is not opposed and her own code is silent, the Church adopts local civil laws in all that pertains to the regulation of contracts (Can. 1529).

The official edition of the Code will contain a preface and an exhaustive analytical index of about two hundred pages. The publication of the octavo edition was expected at the end of September, that of the two smaller editions in October.* Commentaries by noted canonists, let us hope, will not long be delayed.

A. B. MEEHAN.

St. Bernard's Seminary, Rochester, N. Y.

FRANCIS SUAREZ: THE MAN AND HIS STORY.

THE tercentenary of the *Doctor Eximius* is passing away so quietly that there is danger of its going almost unnoticed. Spain had been preparing elaborate celebrations of an international character, but then the deluge of human woe came, and the festivities were greatly marred.

The name of Suárez as a theologian is so familiar to the student of ecclesiastical science that the main incidents of

* A recent cablegram from Rome states that the publication of these three editions has been postponed, but gives no new date of issue.—EDITOR.

his eventful life call for appreciative notice in these pages. He was, to quote the Spanish historian Astrain, like an "ocean gathering to itself all the rivers of theological science flowing from the Fathers through the Middle Ages down to the end of the sixteenth century."¹

It is strange indeed that Suárez should have remained three hundred years without a biographer. The notices of his life written in the seventeenth century, if they can be called biographies, are not easily accessible now and in their actual form appeal but little to our present taste. When Father de Scorraille, as a fitting preparation to the tercentenary, published his *François Suárez*,² he was really giving the world the first "life" of a man who was as refined a gentleman and as exemplary a priest as he was a profound thinker. He made Suárez live as he was—a man whose existence is crowded with great achievements and saddened by many sorrows.

At the very outset of this Life we meet with some strange facts, which are not without their lesson of encouragement for ecclesiastical students. At the foot of the Alhambra in a street now called *Padre Suárez*, is the house where, on 5 January, 1548, the second child of the noble couple, Don Gaspar Suárez de Toledo y Obregón and Doña Antonia Vásquez de Utiel, was born. Seventeen years later we find him asking for admission to the Jesuit novitiate, and his application rejected. Of his schoolmates at this time forty-nine were admitted to the Society. The failure under these circumstances must have been a rude shock to the young nobleman. It appears from the testimony of Fr. Francisco de Morim, a contemporary, that Suárez was considered intellectually unfit, though otherwise capable and good. He had shown no particular love for books while at Salamanca where he attended the Jesuit college. Later on in the year 1564 he was permitted to pass, as it were on trial. If he failed as a scholastic he might become a lay brother. He was not however allowed to remain in the novitiate at Medina del Campo, but after three months was sent to Salamanca, presumably to ascertain whether he could

¹ Antonio Astrain, *Historia de la Compañía de Jesús en la Asistencia de España*, vol. iv, 64, Madrid, 1913.

² Raoul de Scorraille, *François Suárez de la Compagnie de Jésus, d'après ses lettres, ses autres écrits inédits et un grand nombre de documents nouveaux*; 2 vols. in 8, Paris, Lethielleux, 1913.

make anything of the philosophical lectures given there. Francis went, listened attentively, studied persistently, and understood nothing. Rather than go home, he would be a lay brother. It was no use breaking his head. He would never get anywhere.

Then something happened which brings out the golden opportunities as well as the appalling responsibilities of those who supervise ecclesiastical students. Suárez found a friend. Not that his teachers and class-mates had not been kind to him. But, somehow, Fr. Martín Gutiérrez, S.J., later murdered by the Huguenots in France, understood him better than the rest. The kind exhortations of this saintly priest, whose function it was to direct him, fell like a stream of gentle light across the darkness that involved the mind of Suárez, and served as an encouragement to the young student. Unconsciously he safeguarded a vocation to the priesthood and a genius to the Church that were on the point of being diverted from their destined course. Young Suárez understood his lessons now; with amazing rapidity he acquired a grasp of philosophical truth; he outshone all his class-mates, and five years later, at the age of twenty-three, Suárez was appointed teacher of philosophy at Segovia.

Was the intellect of Suárez suddenly touched by a ray of supernatural light, or was it rather his assiduous application, fervent prayer, and the beneficent influence of a loving friend on a boy naturally timid and sensitive that warmed the winter of his desolation and caused his intellectual faculties to exert their latent powers? Maybe, Suárez himself never knew what had happened in him. To an indiscreet inquirer who questioned him in later life as to how he had gained his wealth of knowledge and wisdom, he answered, somewhat evasively perhaps, that, though he considered the little he knew as a gift from above, he had not acquired it without much labor. He was convinced that patient tilling and watering will turn desert land into productive soil, and the sweat of one's brow will make even a sterile intellect bloom.

Before entering upon the activity of Suárez as a writer, let me give a chronological outline of his career. Born at Granada, 5 January, 1548, he entered the Society of Jesus 16 June, 1564; after three months at the novitiate of Medina del Campo,

he studied philosophy and theology at Salamanca from the autumn of 1564 to 1570; in 1571 he began to teach philosophy at Segovia; said his first Mass 25 March, 1572; completed his *triennium* as a professor of philosophy (1574) at Segovia, and then commenced (1575) at Avila that teaching of theology which he was to continue at Valladolid (1576-1580), at Rome (1580-1585), at Alcalá (1585-1592), at Salamanca (1592-1597), and, for about twenty years, at Coimbra (1597-1615). Hence the external facts of the life of Suárez may be summed up thus: a Jesuit at a little less than seventeen, an ecclesiastical student six years, and a teacher about half a century. The monotony of these long years of teaching is relieved by his trials, generally undeserved, and by the writing and publishing of his treatises, which cover well nigh the whole field of Catholic philosophy and theology.³

His first contribution to theological thought was given, as I have intimated, when he was yet a student at Salamanca. It was a scholarly expression of tender homage to the Heavenly Queen, which has since enriched the treatise on *Mariology*. Blessed John of Avila, in the course of a sermon on the prerogatives of Mary, had expressed the opinion that the grace and sanctity which adorned her soul were greater than the grace and sanctity of the Angels and Saints combined. Suárez, who was just then completing his theological course, was called on to illustrate the statement by proofs from Patristic sources. With characteristic zeal for the honor of Our Blessed Lady Suárez elaborated his thesis in the form of a dissertation which, embodied some twenty years later in his *De Mysteriis Vitae Christi*, has become a revered doctrine in Mariology. He made it moreover the theme of his "Grand Act" or solemn disputation at the end of his course, whereby he was knighted, as it were, to fight the intellectual battles in behalf of the Church.

³ Suárez, however, did not write two important treatises, that is, *De Matrimonio* and *De Justitia et Jure*, which, as if to round off the work of the *Doctor Eximius*, were written by two of his confrères, Sánchez and de Lugo. Thirteen volumes in folio of Suárez were published during his lifetime, and fourteen after his death. In the course of this paper we mention only a few of them, and not by their full titles. A partial list of his works may be seen in the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, s. v. "Suarez." The complete list of the published writings of Suárez and their various editions will be found in Sommer-vogel, *Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus*, Brussels and Paris, 1896, t. vii, from col. 1661 to col. 1687.

During the following years Father Suárez remained in comparative obscurity. As a teacher he was greatly esteemed, it is true, by those who came in touch with him; but through these he could hardly be said to speak directly to the educated intellect of Europe. Segovia, Valladolid, and Rome (1571-1585) mark the formative period of his mental development. Those were the quiet years of preparation. Then came the days when Suárez found himself "under a cloud". Busy-bodies within and without the Order accused him vaguely, but persistently, of teaching "novelties." His humility and exquisite gentleness stood him in good stead, though the very delicacy of his refined nature must have made his trial the harder to bear. The explanations he gave to his superiors and the inability of his opponents to prove their charges, were sufficient to clear the young Spanish professor of suspicion, and as a mark of the confidence placed in him by his immediate superiors he was asked to revise the first draft of the *Ratio Studiorum*. This work, the Magna Charta, so to speak, of Jesuit education, had shortly before been outlined under the direction of the General of the Society, Claude Aquaviva. One of the chief hindrances to immediate success as a teacher in the case of Suárez was his eagerness to sound the bottom of every difficulty, or, as he put it in writing to Aquaviva, his wish to go to the "bed-rock of the question". This aim at thoroughness characterized his work throughout. For all his gentlemanly modesty, he could not help referring at times, half humorously, half contemptuously, to the "theology of old copy-books", handed down from one generation of pupils to the next and learned by rote. His own method was to find the *ultima ratio*, to get at principles rather than at precedents, unless it was for the purpose of illustration. Deep insight and first-hand research made him bring out of his treasure-trove *nova et vetera*. Thus he managed to give to old questions a warm living physiognomy. He could not bring himself to treat a question as if it were a "caput mortuum".

The first important work published by Fr. Suárez, at the age of forty-two, was *De Verbo Incarnato* (Alcalá, 1590). The general favor with which the treatise was received caused him to issue soon after this the treatise *De Mysteriis Vitae Christi* (Alcalá, 1592).

The book was denounced to the Inquisition at Madrid by one of Suárez's old teachers at Salamanca, who had conceived a grudge against the young professor, so recently become famous. Moreover, an overjealous, though popular, preacher, Fr. Alfonso de Avendaño, O.P., took occasion to denounce in the pulpit what he considered a misrepresentation of the Sacred Humanity of our Lord. His diatribes were directed against the Jesuits in general, and against Suárez in particular.

The matter was brought before the Inquisition, and the author of *De Mysteryis* was completely vindicated.

When a young priest, Suárez had had an ambition to be a preacher. He tried hard and failed conspicuously. One of his pupils, availing himself of the many privileges of his few years, told Suárez, after a poor oratorical performance: "Your Reverence, I believe, has not been called by God to be a preacher, but only a teacher." Suárez, for all his learning, had a sense of humor and could take a truth from the mouth of children. "It's all for the best", he said, and his career as a preacher came to an end. But, if he could not successfully address a congregation, at least he would endeavor to help gifted preachers to penetrate better the theological "truth which must be the food of piety," as he said in his *Proæmium* to *De Mysteryis Vitæ Christi*.

After this we find Suárez removed from Alcalá and teaching at Salamanca. The change was brought about, at least in part, by Gabriel Vásquez. These two good and great men differed on some points in theology. When Suárez, owing to ill health, was obliged to leave Rome he exchanged places with Vásquez, who had been at Alcalá. The latter remained at Rome six years (1591) and then, owing to some friction with his colleagues, returned to Spain, where, having been assigned to teach, he met Suárez at Alcalá. Aquaviva, that shrewd judge of human nature, wishing to prevent a possible clash between two teachers of decidedly original mind and sensitive disposition, advised that Suárez should remain a professor of theology and Vásquez should devote himself to writing, "provided", he wrote to Vásquez, "you keep your eyes wide open in the choice of opinions". Vásquez was delighted with the appointment. But the aureole of popularity which surrounded

this brilliant and vivacious teacher set a number of hearts astir in the University of Alcalá. They wanted *him* to teach, though Vázquez, be it said to his honor, had no idea of ousting Suárez. The latter begged to be removed. He realized fully the delicacy of his position. Things went on in this way for two years, till for the peace of all concerned Vázquez was appointed to replace Suárez, and Suárez went to Salamanca (1593).

Thus the legend to the effect that, when Vázquez entered the class-room in the evening, he would ask: "What did the old man teach this morning?" "Quid dixit vetulus mane?" and forthwith would defend the opposite opinion, falls in the light of the facts. In the first place, Suárez and Vázquez were not teaching in the same institution, and, secondly, it would hardly enter the mind of Vázquez to call Suárez *vetulus*, inasmuch as Suárez was only two or three years his senior, that is, not yet quite forty-five. The fact is that these two eminent men esteemed each other greatly. Vázquez, to quote only one instance, characterized the work of Suárez, *De Mysteriis Vitae Christi*, as "an eminent service to sacred science," coming from one who had been "the first to subject to a rigorous theological critique all the questions appertaining to the life and greatness of the Virgin Mary". Suárez held Vázquez in equal esteem, as is manifest from the testimony of his contemporaries.

It was fortunate, at all events, that Suárez went to Salamanca. There he worked prodigiously. In four years, besides publishing other works, he almost completed his *Disputationes Metaphysicae*, than which there are few more colossal works in the history of philosophy. These years of achievement were going by quietly on the whole, when Philip II, King of Spain, curtly ordered Suárez to Coimbra. That University needed a celebrity, and all the objections of Suárez notwithstanding, he must go. Suárez bowed his head, packed his manuscripts and arrived at Coimbra on 1 May, 1597.

He had been there only a few weeks when a good friar and clever professor, Egidio *a Praesentatione*, raised a disturbance over the fact that "a man with no diploma to prove his competency" was given such an important chair in the University. The Jesuit Provincial of Portugal came to the rescue of Suárez. Availing himself of a certain privilege which

he had, he gave Suárez a degree ready made. It is worthless, they said, it must be conferred by a university. And Suárez went to Evora, had himself made a doctor and came back to Coimbra after some time with all the trappings of the office. In spite of all these vexations he was happy in his little cell of the Jesuit College.

That year, 1602, was an eventful one. On 31 January, Clement VIII notified the Generals of the Dominicans and of the Jesuits that he was going to preside personally over the disputations hinging on that most tantalizing of theological problems—the conciliation of free will and efficacious grace. On 14 February, Clement sent to the two Fathers General the articles which were to be treated in the first *Congregatio de Auxiliis*, and on 20 March he himself opened the disputations. Then the Church of God beheld that most singular spectacle, never seen before or since, of a Supreme Pontiff, surrounded by Cardinals and Consultors, presiding for three years over the examination of a book. That book was the famous *Concordia* of Molina, published at Lisbon in 1588. It is popularly believed that the well known theological difference between Jesuits and Dominicans dates from the publication of this book. As a matter of fact, both Orders had been teaching their systems for some time, and the first public and even noisy manifestation of an intellectual clash took place as early as the end of 1581 or the beginning of 1582, when Fr. Prudencio de Montemayor, S.J., a teacher at the University of Salamanca, defended in a disputation the system later elaborated by his confrères, Molina and Suárez. It seems that the thesis defended by Montemayor was not on the matter of *Grace* directly, but on the merits of Christ and our Lord's *mandatum moriendi*. Fray Domingo Báñez, O.P., objected vigorously against the doctrine expounded by the defendant, and drifting from one point to another the disputants entered the *mare magnum* of predestination and free will. Fray Domingo de Guzmán, O.P., spoke to corroborate the view of his confrère, and Fray Luis de León, that celebrated teacher and exquisite poet, came forth valiantly to defend the position of the young Jesuit. It was a hot dispute. The controversy spread and was brought before the Inquisition. Both Montemayor, who was but an obscure teacher, and the great Fray Luis de León

found themselves in a sea of trouble. A truce of six years followed. Then, in 1588, the book of Molina appeared.

This is a parenthesis, however, meant to place the affair of Suárez in its proper setting and, incidentally, to clarify a point which is often vaguely treated by the older historians of the controversy *De Auxiliis*. When, then, the *De Poenitentia* of Suárez made its appearance, Thomism and Congruism were being argued *pro* and *contra* in the presence of Clement. The champions of the two systems, Báñez and Molina, had remained under their tents in Spain while the battle was going on in Rome. The brethren at home were carrying on a little guerilla warfare, and who shall say that there were not faults on both sides? Anyhow, what concerns us here is that letters were exchanged between Báñez and Lemos—the latter representing the former in Rome—concerning the book of Suárez. The Holy Office was at work on it. A condemnation was impending. Suárez sensed the storm, and his heart sank within him. Had he offended the Pope? Would not a condemnation of his book reflect on his whole lifework? Would not his Jesuit brethren, already sorely tried, suffer on his account? ⁴ In August, 1603, he sent a memorial to Clement VIII through Aquaviva. The Papal Nuncio wrote to Rome commending Suárez. Philip III begged the Pope to save the reputation of so great a theologian. But the blow fell at last, and it nearly crushed Suárez, who became seriously ill. On 31 July, 1603, the Holy Office had issued a decree: "Sanctissimus decrevit ut liber suspendatur donec emendetur et corrigatur," etc. Suárez, furthermore was forbidden to publish any theological books without previously obtaining the approval of the Inquisition.

As soon as Suárez had sufficiently recovered, the Nuncio advised him to go to Rome. Clement, it must have been observed, even when condemning the book had not pronounced himself, at least directly, as to the tenability of the interpretation given by Suárez to the decree of 20 June, 1602. Suárez wished that the question should be looked into more closely, and for this reason started for Rome in May, 1604. On his way, he wrote most

⁴ Suárez, however, knew that the Society of Jesus had never sponsored or favored his interpretation. The first edition of the *Ratio Studiorum* obliged Jesuit professors, some sixteen years before the decree of Clement, to teach this proposition: "Poenitentiae Sacramentum absenti per nuntium seu per litteras collatum, non est validum."

of his *De Deo Unio et Trino*. The Pope received him very kindly at Frascati. But, the pious speculations of the older biographers notwithstanding, Suárez elicited no answer from the Pope, and the question dragged on till March of 1605, when Clement died. Leo XI succeeded him for a few days, and then Paul V ascended the papal throne. The same Pontiff who in 1607 was to bring the *Congregationes de Auxiliis* to a close by sending the disputants home, telling them he would solve the question when he thought fit and by allowing them in the meantime to defend their respective systems, without, however, censuring their adversaries—the same Pontiff, much as he loved Suárez, brought his affair quickly to a head by declaring, through the Holy Office, on 14 July, 1605, that the interpretation given by Suárez to the decree of 20 June, 1602, was untenable.⁵

Perhaps this step was more trying to Paul V than to Suárez, for the Pope loved the Spanish theologian dearly. He wished to keep him by his side and it was even rumored that he would raise him to the Cardinalate. Suárez, who in spite of the extreme sensitiveness he had shown in this affair, was a very humble religious, was glad when through the intercession of Bellarmine he was allowed to leave Rome for Coimbra (September, 1605). On his way there he stopped at Lyons, at Avignon, Barcelona, Valencia, and Salamanca, and was received with acclaim everywhere. He reached Coimbra early in 1606. It is noteworthy in this connexion that the Pontiff who rejected the interpretation of Suárez nevertheless sent to him (2 October, 1607) the famous Brief from which posterity had derived the theological surname of Suárez, that of *Doctor Eximius*. Though in failing health Suárez continued to work prodigiously. His books appeared in quick succession, and his admirable treatise *De Legibus* appeared in 1612.

In 1610, his great friend Paul V requested Suárez to refute the *Apologia* of King James I of England. That pseudo-theologian who was then occupying the English throne had exacted from his subjects an oath of fealty which Catholics could not take in conscience. To justify the oath the king

⁵ The substance of the decree and an important caveat appended to the same, may be seen in the note given by Denzinger to the number quoted above.

wrote or induced some theologians to write the *Apologia* against two Briefs of the Pope and a famous letter of Bellarmine⁶ to the archpriest Blackwell. Paul V desired that a thorough refutation of the book should be made, and Suárez, much as he disliked the work,⁷ wrote the *Defensio Fidei*. The book proved a severe blow to the English king. It stirred even greater excitement in France. Suárez had dwelt on the question of the power of the Pope over secular princes,⁸ and had touched upon the question *de occisione tyranni*.⁹ At the instigation of the English king, the French parliament condemned the *Defensio*. The book was burned at Paris, and the Jesuits were persecuted. Even in quarters where Suárez should have expected sympathy and support, he found distrust and opposition. Philip III, however, stood faithfully by him. Paul V declared that the doctrine expounded by Suárez was in accordance with the decree of the Council of Constance,¹⁰ and with his usual tact and energy, calmed the troubled waters which threatened the very existence of the Society in France. The last great trial of Suárez, which gave him a taste of political trouble, was over. When another Brief of his friend Paul V, praising the work of Suárez, reached Lisbon, the *Doctor Eximius* had already passed away (25 September, 1617).

The three ensuing years he spent teaching and completing the volumes which were published after his death. Broken in health, he was allowed, in November of 1615, to resign his chair at Coimbra.

In directing attention to the long and eventful life of Suárez I have been able to give but a few incidents to characterize the man and his story. The reader who would have a more complete account must go directly to Fr. de Scorraille, whose two volumes give a true and beautiful picture of the great Jesuit theologian.

JAPHETH S. JOLLAIN, S.J.

St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri.

⁶ Published under the pseudonym of Matteo Torti.

⁷ Cfr. *Proæmium* to *Defensio Fidei Catholice et Apostolicæ adversus Anglicanæ Sectæ Errores*, Coimbra, 1613.

⁸ Especially in the third book, "De summi Pontificis supra temporales reges excellentia et potestate."

⁹ Cf. liber vi, cap. iv.

¹⁰ Cf. Denzinger, *Enchiridion*, n. 690.

FATHER HUGO OBERMAIER.

The Time and Place of the Cave Man in World History.

UNDOUBTEDLY to the Abbé Breuil, as I said in the preceding article,¹ more than to any other, the present generation owes the most precious information in proof that the cave man, our earliest known ancestor in Europe, was an artist. Possessed of no inconsiderable artistic ability himself, Abbé Breuil has carefully and sympathetically studied the examples of art produced by these oldest European artistic colleagues and has reproduced them sympathetically for all those throughout the world who cannot have the precious opportunity to see them for themselves. The distinguished priest's work in this regard has completely revolutionized our ideas about man and has made it very clear that the commonly accepted notions of our own and immediately preceding generations with regard to man's constant progress upward from century to century, if actually not from decade to decade, as some seem to think, are quite absurd and founded on some ridiculous assumptions which prove now to have no foundation in any of the realities of prehistory or archeology.

It was extremely important, however, for us to know as far as possible the date at which these men lived and their place in prehistory as regards their known successors in time. These are the men of the Paleolithic time (or the Old Stone Age, to translate that Greek epithet), and we want to know their relations in time and development to the men of the Neolithic period, as well as to the Lake Dwellers, and then the early modern races. It is very interesting to realize that this all important work in chronology owes more to another priest than to any other worker. Curiously enough, though the caves were situated in Western France and Northern Spain, the man to whom we owe more in the chronological department of paleolithic paleontology was a German, Father Hugo Obermaier of Munich. He had quite as significant material to work with as Abbé Breuil, who gave himself to the pictures on the walls of the caves, only it required more patient and careful study to elaborate the significance of this material and

¹ ECCL. REVIEW, September, 1917, pp. 257-268.

to trace the meaning of the various objects and their relations to all the knowledge that has been gradually accumulating, for more than half a century, with regard to the cave men.

Father Obermaier's merit in this regard has been recognized by the authorities in the subject all over the world. When Professor Henry Fairfield Osborn, Research Professor of Zoology, Columbia University, New York, and Curator of Vertebrate Paleontology in the American Museum of Natural History, wrote several years ago his book *Men of the Old Stone Age, Their Environment, Life and Art*, in which the story of the cave man is given in considerable detail, he did so only after having visited the caves of North Spain and of the Dordogne in South France. Then he dedicated his volume to the men who had proved helpful to him in enabling him to secure first-hand information on all these details. That dedication runs: "To my distinguished guides through the upper paleolithic caverns of the Pyrenees, Dordogne and the Cantabrian Mountains of Spain, Emile Cartailhac, Henri Breuil, Hugo Obermaier." How curiously interesting it is to think that two of these three men whose names are thus placed, and rightly, at the head of the volume of scientific constructive work which has attracted most attention in recent years, are Catholic priests. How different that fact is from the very definite impression so generally accepted that the Church is opposed to scientific development, and especially to science that would lead us to think that man lived on earth so long ago, and that at least priests would not be liberal-minded enough to be the great scientific pioneers in such a remarkable development.

OBERMAIER'S PATIENT RESEARCH AND ITS REWARD.

Father Obermaier above all has worked out the significance of a number of remains that at first seemed to be merely accidental forms in nature, and yet when found under the circumstances in which they occurred had a very significant meaning in archeology. At first, as pointed out by Obermaier, the earliest man in Europe, while recognizing the need of artificial aids in the shape of tools, found it difficult to make these for himself and had to be satisfied to help himself with such rude pieces of flint that he found. He was dependent on the chance

shape of fragments of flint which he shattered by letting them fall from heights or by letting heavy stones fall on them. He had not yet learned to shape them symmetrically. In the search after the most useful form of flint which could be grasped by the hand for various purposes, a rather characteristic form was evolved of which a great many are found actually in or in close proximity to the cave dwellings. Very soon the cave man learned, however, to shape suitably sized flints more or less into the form of almonds, so that they could be easily grasped by the hand, there being a rather smooth surface for the palm and a sharp edge leading to a point on the other side. Dr. Obermaier worked out the progress of flint shaping, by himself learning patiently how to fashion flints for various purposes and thus demonstrating the course of old time flint tool making.

Father Obermaier spent some three years in the great grotto of Castillo near Ponte Viesgo in the province of Santander, Northern Spain. Professor Osborn mentions his visit to that grotto with Obermaier as most illuminating. The results of investigations conducted were most fruitful in scientific results. The deposits which filled the grotto presented in cross section altogether some forty-five feet in thickness, reaching from the floor to the roof. Father Obermaier succeeded in differentiating some thirteen layers of distinct interest, and these proved to cover eleven periods of "industry", representing many different kinds of flint tools and other implements. Indeed this grotto, now famous in archeology, provided by itself a magnificent epitome of the prehistorical period of Western Europe from what is known as the Acheulean Age (because the first deposits recognized as belonging to it were found near St. Acheul in France), to the age of bronze in this same part of the country. Father Obermaier has found that the floor of the grotto was possibly used as a flint-making station in the Acheulean and very likely also in Chellean times.

Father Obermaier made a series of experiments with flints which showed exactly how the early flint workers had gone about producing the forms of flint implements which are now so commonly found. While these men were satisfied at first with the accidental sharp edge that they picked up in quarries, they soon learned how to flake flints and to fashion them skil-

fully by retouching until they secured a really symmetrical almond form, which fitted the hand very well and made a very effective tool for a great many purposes. They were able to produce symmetrical instruments with straight, convex, or concave cutting edges at will, until the specialization of their instruments for various purposes must have become a craft requiring a great deal of ingenuity.

THE CAVES AS DWELLINGS.

Father Obermaier has pointed out the vicissitudes of the history of the cave man in his cave dwelling. He finds that long before these caves were inhabited by man, they served as lairs or refuges for the cave bear and the cave hyena, their homes being shared by a number of birds of prey. Sometimes large numbers of skeletons of these animals are found within the caves, and it would seem as though man must have had a hard struggle not only to drive the animals out but to keep them out in inclement weather. While of course the men and women lived mainly near the entrance to the cave, it is well known that even a short distance from the entrance to such underground workings the temperature is likely to be very uniform and never cold. While it might seem as though cave dwelling would be very unhealthy, Father Obermaier points out that the smallest cave was considerably larger and better ventilated than the small smoky cabins of some of the European peasants of the present day, or the snow huts of the Esquimo.

The principal hardship in cave life was the dampness in the winter time. This could not be expelled in any complete way by fire, because the smoke would have been otherwise impossible to stand. During spring, in times of freshets, the cave men were often displaced from their dwellings and these were made uninhabitable by the seepage of water. But every spring in our time somewhere in the world and usually somewhere in the United States, many hundreds and even many thousands of people are driven from their homes and suffer severely because of flood conditions. The dampness of many of the dwellings, however, gave rise to certain arthritic conditions, with swellings of joints, so often called rheumatic in the modern time, though not always with complete justi-

fication; and there seems no doubt that the rheumatoid diseases were rather frequent, for bones are found of both men and beasts exhibiting diseased swellings and chronic inflammatory conditions of the vertebræ such as are associated with extreme dampness. It is rather interesting to find that man reacted to a damp environment at that time quite as he does at the present time and we have not as yet found any remedies for preventing such afflictions.

What Father Obermaier has done for us particularly, besides bringing out the significance of the various objects found in the cave, is to place the epoch at which these various finds must be considered to have happened in the history of the race and of the earth, that is, in the geology of the earth's surface. His book on *The Man of the Early Time*² is very well known and forms the basis for nearly all the scientific writing on the subject that we have had in recent years. Father Obermaier has worked out the problems of the relationship of the artistic finds and other remains to one another and to the human skulls that have been discovered, and has placed the progress and decadence of the races as well as calculated about the length of time that the various stratas of culture and geologic horizons in which these remains occur, lasted. For strange as it must seem to those who have been quite sure of the assumption that the cave man was a savage, we know now that not only we have the right to speak of culture in his regard, but actually these patient investigators have been able to trace a series of cultures among the earliest known ancestors of man.

CULTURE AMONG THE CAVE MEN.

Long before pictures were found on the walls of the caves it had been recognized that the cave man was an artistic artisan, and even something of his startling and marvelous ability in pure art had come to be recognized. Among the very earliest things that were found in the caves and that attracted special attention to the old-time dwellers in them were implements or utensils of various kinds which had been used by the cave men and which bore on them ample evidence that he

² *Der Mensch der Vorzeit.*

had an artistic spirit. These objects, bone and horn and ivory and other material, some of which are among the most resistant to the vicissitudes of time that we know, had been preserved in the debris on the floor of the caves. A great many of them proved, when carefully examined and when the dirt that had gathered around them had been removed, to have on them very interesting engravings, that is, pictures scratched with a sharp pointed instrument.

It was a good while, however, before the high quality of this engraving came to be generally appreciated. A large number of objects were collected, but the markings on them were supposed to be more or less crude and very primitive misrepresentations of the animals hunted by these early men. Indeed it was only after the discovery of the pictures in oils on the walls of the caves that a more careful study of the smaller objects found in the caves showed clearly that there had been in our hands abundant evidence of the fine artistry of the cave men even before the wall pictures were known. The engravings on bone and ivory and horn were thoroughly artistic in quality in a great many cases, vigorous vivid representations of animals of all kinds presented in many ways, and modes of activity.

The cave man then came to be studied from two very different aspects, though these two had many very intimate relations, and the researches were founded, not on theory but on actual study of remains. There was in the caves a mural or parietal art consisting of the pictures in oils on the walls and occasionally the ceilings, and then besides there was the movable art, as it came to be called, consisting of the decorated objects of various kinds which soon began to crowd the museums. While Abbé Breuil did so much, as we have seen in the former article, to develop our knowledge of the mural or parietal art of the caves, he helped also to bring out the significance of the movable art. It remained, however, for Father Obermaier to trace the evolution of these art objects and to give them their proper places in prehistory. There proved on careful investigation to be a series of various cultures to delineate and of divers horizons of progress and decadence to locate, for early as these objects are in the history of man, both upward and downward artistic tendencies are to be noted in them.

All their archeological relations were illuminated by the careful researches of Father Obermaier and above all by his intuition amounting to genius in recognizing and appreciating even minute differences.

DOMESTIC LIFE OF THE CAVE MAN.

The domestic life of the cave man becomes very interesting. Here is a man who makes his home beautiful by painting in oil on the walls of it, and makes too all the implements and utensils of daily use as beautiful as he can make them by simple decorative procedures which do not interfere with their usefulness. It would be hard to think that the life in such a home must be that of the savage or anything but rather a pleasant existence. Of course we have the popular science theories, the oft-repeated declarations of newspaper and magazine science, those fosterers of pseudo-knowledge which has to be corrected and which serves only to make people more ignorant, that the cave man's wife was a slave whom he had probably dragged home by the hair of the head and kept in his domicile merely to care for his children; but there is not the slightest bit of evidence for this; it is all mere assumption. Granted that evolution from the beast to man is true, then this must be so, the evolutionists declare, and that's all about it.

We have come to realize during the present generation that most of the things that were declared by science or pseudo-science that they must be so, are not really so, and we are trying to find out not new theories but new facts. The facts with regard to the cave man's home are accumulating. He tried to make it beautiful. Fortunately, among these pictures, of which of course some at least may have been made by the cave woman, for there is not the slightest reason to think that the cave man alone had a sense of beauty, we have some that give us a good idea of the human beings of that time. These provide an excellent basis for reflection as to the real status of the women of the period, in one regard at least. The cave artist always pictures his women folk as rounded and fat, and indeed rather inclined to be obese. He almost never pictures her without children near her, and his ideal evidently was the rounded, rubicund, healthy mother of children, and not at all the thin younger woman on whom the modern artist

expends his efforts so exclusively. Almost needless to say, only an abiding interest in her and the children could have dictated this.

On the other hand we have also some though but a few pictures from the cave man of cave men. Masculine human beings are always represented as muscular and athletic, thoroughly fit, as it were, but not at all fat. Manifestly, his ideal man was the athlete who could go out and chase the animals successfully and who could compete with any of them in strength of muscle and vigor and rapidity of movement. The contrast between the cave man and the cave woman in this regard is very interesting. The conclusion is almost forced on us that the cave woman sat down at home and cared for her children, lived, as it were, on the fat of the land, and so became stout and rounded, while her lord and master by the rude strenuous work of the chase and the demanding efforts of the hunt was thoroughly hardened into athletic fitness.

Such stout women could not very well have been drudges. On the contrary, the rule of humanity has always been that it was when men have succeeded in making it possible by their successful efforts in creating a home life in which their wives did not have to work that these wives became stout or even fat. Farmers' wives are usually rather thin. The old pioneer women in America were thin and wiry, though their descendants with more leisure and better eating are getting so fat that foreigners are demanding whether the caricatures of Uncle Sam and his wife as thin and rather scrawny individuals are not a living lie, for certainly even the older American families are not represented very often by such types in our day.

In a good many of the caves that were manifestly the homes of the cave people many split long bones have been found. The one reason for splitting bones is to get at the marrow of them. The marrow even in our time represents a delicacy that is much sought after. Evidently, the cave man or his wife had learned the secret of the dietary quality of grilled marrow, and so we have a great many remains of these split long bones. It has been suggested that an indulgence in a diet that contains a good deal of grilled marrow, especially if the individual was not compelled to take very much exercise, would produce a state of obesity such as the cave man some-

times pictured his women folks in, as rapidly as does Huylers' candy in our time. It is only those who have abundant time for eating and the preparation of toothsome delicacies who can take the pains to split bones in order to secure the marrow within them in such easily edible quantities, as readily produces a tendency to corpulency at least. The whole story as thus outlined for us is extremely interesting and Father Obermaier's studies of moveable cave art and of the other objects found in the debris on the floor of the caves has brought out a great deal beyond even this of suggestive information.

BELIEF IN IMMORTALITY.

What is even more interesting perhaps is the evidence that these cave men had a very firm and thoroughly practical belief in immortality for which they were quite ready to make rather serious sacrifices. The bodies of the dead were buried with implements near them to take with them to the other world and even traces have been found of the burial of food with them for their journey. Not infrequently red pigment of one kind or another is found also in the grave, and the explanation of its presence usually given is that the cave men wanted their dead relatives to look well. What struck them most was the greenish pallor of the dead and to avoid their appearing with this in another world, where they were as yet strangers, red ochre was buried with them to give them a ruddy appearance.

This may seem to many to be a sign of barbarism and of savagery, but let us not forget that at the present time the undertaker is very careful to make corpses look nice by rouging them and even by padding sunken cheeks and jaws and the like. Human nature has not changed very much in the thousands of years since the cave man's time, and we still want to have our dead look beautiful, just as Hector's mother Hecuba rejoiced over the fact that her son's body had not been marred in spite of Achilles having dragged it many times around the walls of Troy.

The dead of the cave dwellers were dressed in their best. Apparently some of their finest implements were placed beside them, and the living were quite willing to make the sacrifice of beautiful things over which many hours of labor

had been spent, in the desire to provide their dead friends with the instruments necessary, as they believed, for life in another world. I understand that there has never been a tribe found that did not prove on careful investigation to have some religious ideas and above all a sure confidence in a here-after. The cave men might very well be expected to have had it as well as the others, though this evidence for it has proved rather surprising to a good many people.

WAR AND THE CAVE MAN.

It is interesting to appreciate that the investigation of the caves was interrupted just as it had reached this interesting point by the war in Europe. Just before the war began, a French nobleman and his three sons were engaged in exploring one of the most interesting caves that had been uncovered in recent years. The call to arms at once put an end to the expedition, for two of the sons were called to the colors and the third for preliminary training. I believe that one of the young men has since been killed, another has been wounded, and the father, all of whose attention is now devoted to patriotic work, is alone. That exploration will never be resumed by the same investigators. Indeed it seems very dubious as to when such researches can be taken up seriously again in France. We are thousands of years after the cave men, with all the progress that is supposed to have taken place since then; but it is war that makes it impossible to go on with the interesting researches of the cave man.

One of the French archeologists, Commont, who has spent a good deal of time investigating the cave man's life and customs during the past twenty years, does not hesitate to declare that the older cave man, the maker of his home beautiful, when that home was only a cave, had no weapons for war. He killed the animals that he hunted by dead falls, that is, by pits dug in the path that the animal was accustomed to follow to water, and then covered with branches and a light layer of dirt so that if the animal were scared he would in his hurry rush upon this light frame work and then plunge to death in the pit below. The weapons or rather implements that are found are for peaceful avocations, the skinning of animals, the sharpening of bones, the graving of bone and horn and the like,

but not for war. Could there be any more curious contrast possible than our cave-man ancestor demonstrated as a man of peace, while we as descendants of thousands of years later are engaged in the greatest war that humanity has ever waged. Verily man is a very curious creature and the more we *know* of him, forgetting our theories and waiting for real knowledge, the more curious and inexplicable he becomes.

When the war broke out Father Obermaier was fortunately engaged in archeological work on the Spanish side of the Pyrenees in connexion with the cave dwellings of Spain, or he might have found it extremely difficult to go on with his scientific labors, and perhaps even have suffered some personal inconvenience. As it is, the pursuit of his research work was sadly disturbed by the war, but his presence in Spain led to the creation for him of the Directorship of the Paleontological Institute in Madrid, where he is continuing his work of classifying, arranging, and bringing out the significance of the many specimens, especially of movable art, that have been found in the caves of Spain.

After even this brief story of his work, with that of Abbé Breuil, and the results which they have produced on human thinking, it is not difficult to understand why the claim should be made that probably no other two men have done so much in our present generation to revolutionize human thought with regard to the history of man than these two faithful clergymen. So far from being hampered in their work in any sense of the word by the ecclesiastical authorities, they have been encouraged, materially aided, and their very priestly character has been of a distinct help to them in their work. They have done in our generation for man what the Abbot Mendel did for heredity, and their work fills a corresponding place in a particular department of biology. Father Mendel found after a time that he was called to higher things in his own order and left his scientific work reasonably complete, though its significance was not to be recognized for a generation later. These two clergymen have been more fortunate, and practically no one writes anywhere in the world on paleontology and archeology without quoting them.

The respect in which Obermaier is held will be readily appreciated from the fact that, when the war disturbed his work

and cut off his connexions with his home country, a position was provided for him in a foreign country, in Catholic Spain, so that he might be able to go on with his precious scientific work during the war. The whole story is extremely interesting from a human point of view, but still more significant because of the light that it throws on the real relations between the Church and Science.

JAMES J. WALSH.

New York City.



Analecta.

AOTA BENEDIOTI PP. XV.

FOEDERI MISSAE QUOTIDIANAE IN ARCHIDIOECESI NEO-EBORACENSI INDULGENTIAE ET PRIVILEGIA IN PERPETUUM CONCEDUNTUR.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam. Dilectus filius Noster Ioannes M. S. R. E. Cardinalis Farley, ex concessione et dispensatione apostolica Archiepiscopus Neo-Eboracensis, Nos edocendos curavit, se in id venisse consilii, ut in sua quoque Archidioecesi "Foedus Missae quotidianae" institueret, quod iam in Hibernia insula conditum, recens a Nobis caelestibus Ecclesiae thesauris locupletatum fuit. Cum autem vehementer optet, etiam sibi concreditos fideles ad Sacrum singulis diebus audiendum allici, atque inde facilius divino convivio recreari; enixas Nobis preces adhibuit, ut constituendo Operi easdem ac pro Hibernia tum plenarias, tum partiales indulgentias largiri dignaremur. Nos igitur, quibus est omnino persuasum, uberes ex huiusmodi religionis pietatisque Foedere fructus in Domino perceptum iri, audito etiam dilecto filio Nostro S. R. E. Cardinali Poenitentiario Maiore, piis hisce votis benigne obsecundandum censuimus. Quare, praesentium tenore, Apostolica Auctoritate Nostra, omnibus ac singulis utriusque sexus Christifidelibus Archidioeceseos Neo-Eboracensis tantum, qui ad "Foedus Missae quotidianae" pertinebunt, die primo eorum in hanc

Sodalitatem ingressus, si vere poenitentes et confessi Ssmum Eucharistiae Sacramentum sumpserint, plenariam; ac sodalibus in eadem Consociatione describendis, in cuiuslibet eorum mortis articulo, si vere poenitentes et confessi ac S. Communionem refecti, vel, quatenus id facere nequiverint, saltem contriti, nomen Iesu ore, si potuerint, sin minus corde devote invocaverint, etiam plenariam; nec non praedictis sodalibus, qui quovis anni mense saltem novem diebus continuis Missae interfuerint, atque uno quo cuique libeat ex novem hisce diebus, vere poenitentes et confessi Sacra se Communionem refecerint, ac Missa durante pro Christianorum Principum concordia, haeresum extirpatione, peccatorum conversione ac S. Matris Ecclesiae exaltatione pias ad Deum preces effuderint, plenariam similiter omnium peccatorum suorum indulgentiam et remissionem misericorditer in Domino concedimus atque impertimus. Praeterea iisdem Sodalibus, qui, corde saltem contrito, quolibet profesto die Missam audiverint, eaque durante, ut praefertur, oraverint, septem annos totidemque quadragenas; iis autem sociis, qui quodvis pietatis vel caritatis opus ex dicti Foederis praescripto peregerint, centum dies de iniunctis eis, seu alias quomodolibet debitis poenitentiis in forma Ecclesiae consueta relaxamus. Quas omnes et singulas indulgentias, peccatorum remissiones ac poenitentiarum relaxationes, excepta plenaria indulgentia in articulo mortis lucranda, etiam animabus fidelium in Purgatorio detentis per modum suffragii applicari posse indulgemus. Denique veniam Apostolica Auctoritate Nostra facimus, cuius vi Missae, ad quodlibet altare pro anima cuiusvis sodalis celebrandae, animae ipsi perinde suffragentur ac si ad privilegiatum altare fuissent celebratae. Non obstantibus contrariis quibuscumque. Praesentibus perpetuo valituris. Volumus autem ut praesentium Literarum transumptis, seu exemplis, etiam impressis, manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis ac sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate vel officio constitutae munitis, eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XXVI iunii MCMXVII, Pontificatus Nostri anno tertio.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status*.

ACTA OFFICIORUM.

DE PRAESCRIPTIS ALIQUORUM CODICIS CANONUM.

Episcopi aliive locorum Ordinarii complures a SS. D. N. Benedicto Pp. XV demisse efflagitarunt ut, nulla interposita mora, vigere incipiant praescripta Codicis i. e. quae sequuntur:

1. Canonis 859, § 2;
2. Canonis 1108, § 3;
3. Canonis 1247, § 1;
4. Canonis 1250, 1251, 1252, 1253, 1254.

Beatissimus Pater, in audientia die 19 mensis augusti infrascripto Cardinali data, relatas preces benigne excipiens, decrevit, praescripta canonum de quibus supra, ex hoc ipso die vim habere; praetereaque, Motu proprio concessit ut S. R. C. Cardinales jam nunc omnibus ac singulis fruantur privilegiis quae can. 239, n. 1, 240, 600, n. 3, 1189, 1401, ejusdem Codicis describuntur. Quae omnia promulgari jussit, contrariis quibuslibet minime obstantibus.

Ex aedibus Vaticanis die 20 mensis Augusti anni 1917.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status*.

S. CONGREGATIO DE SEMINARIIS ET DE STUDIORUM
UNIVERSITATIBUS.

DE NOVO IURIS CANONICI CODICE IN SCHOLIS PROPONENDO.

Cum novum iuris canonici Codicem SS. D. N. Benedictus Pp. XV a die festo Pentecostes proximi anni millesimi non-gentesimi duodevicesimi in universa latina Ecclesia vim habiturum esse edixerit, liquet ex eo ipso die Codicem fore authenticum et unicum juris canonici fontem, proptereaque tum in disciplina Ecclesiae moderanda, tum in judiciis et scholis eo uno utendum esse. Quam sit igitur necessarium, clericis praesertim, Codicem probe nosse atque omnino habere perspectum, nemo est qui non videat.

Itaque Sacra haec Congregatio, ut in re tanti momenti rectae alumnorum institutioni pro officio suo consulat, omnibus ac singulis studiorum Universitatibus et juris canonici Lyceis quae, ad normam can. 256, § 1, eidem Sacrae Congregationi parent, praecipit ac mandat, ut in schola antehac *textus* aptis-

sime nuncupata, in qua jus canonicum penitus copioseque praelegitur, ita in posterum ejusmodi disciplina tradatur, ut alumni, non modo Codicis sententia *synthetice* proposita, sed accurata quoque uniuscujusque canonis *analysisi*, ad cognoscendum et intelligendum Codicem veluti manu ducantur: debent scilicet doctores juri canonico tradendo, ipso Codicis ordine ac titulorum capitumque serie religiosissime servata, singulos canones diligenti explanatione interpretari. Iidem tamen magistri, antequam dicere de aliquo instituto juridico aggrediantur, apte exponant qui ejus fuerit ortus, quae decursu temporis acciderint progressionem, mutationes ac vices, ut discipuli plenioris juris cognitionem assequantur.

Nulla ceterum, praeter Codicem, libro alumnos uti necesse erit; quodsi doctoribus placuerit eos unum aliquem adhibere librum, id sancte retinendum, ut non ejus libri ordini ordo Codicis, sed huic ille aptetur et accommodetur.

Romae, ex aedibus S. Congregationis de Seminariis et Studiorum Universitatibus, die VII mensis Augusti anni MCMXVII.

CAJETANUS CARD. BISLETTI, *Praefectus*.

L. * S.

IOSEPH ROSSINO, *Substitutus*.

SACRA POENITENTIARIA APOSTOLICA.

(Sectio de Indulgentiis.)

DUBIA CIRCA ALTARIA PRIVILEGIATA ET MISSAS IN EIS
CELEBRANDAS.

Propositis S. Poenitentiariae Apostolicae dubiis:

1. An privilegium Altaris applicari possit pluribus defunctis, pro quibus Missa celebratur?
2. An recipi queant onera perpetua Missarum ad Altare privilegiatum celebrandarum?

S. Tribunal, die 3 julii, anno 1917, respondendum censuit:

Ad 1. *Negative*, prout jam decisum fuit a S. Congregatione Indulgentiarum, decretis dierum 29 februarii 1864 et 19 junii 1880;

Ad 2. Recipi possunt, dummodo numerus Missarum, tam fundatarum quam adventitiarum, sit talis ut eis commode satisfieri possit.

Et in audientia, subsignata die, infrascripto Cardinali Poenitentiario Majori impertita, SS. D. N. D. Benedictus div. Prov. Pp. XV, has responsiones in omnibus approbavit, jussitque ut publici fierent juris.

Datum Romae, in S. Poenitentiaria, die 6 julii 1917.

GULIELMUS CARD. VAN ROSSUM, *Poen. Major.*

F. BORGONGINI DUCA, S.P., *Secretarius.*

ROMAN CURIA.

PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS.

By Consistorial Decree:

24 August: The Right Rev. John McIntyre is raised to the Archiepiscopal Titular See of Oxyrynchia, and appointed Auxiliary to the Most Rev. Dr. Ilsley, Archbishop of Birmingham.

The Right Rev. Dennis Matthew Lowney is raised to the Episcopal Titular See of Adrianopolis, and appointed Auxiliary to the Right Rev. Matthew Harkins, Bishop of Providence.

By Brief through the S. Congregation of Propaganda:

27 July: The Right Rev. Patrice Chiasson, of the Eudist Fathers, is appointed Vicar Apostolic of the Gulf of St. Lawrence Vicariate in Canada (Province of Quebec).

By Note of the Secretariate of State:

4 May: Monsignor William A. Pape, of the Diocese of Sioux City, is made Domestic Prelate.

16 June: Monsignor Charles Bancroft Murray, of the Archdiocese of Kingston (Canada), is made Domestic Prelate.

29 July: Monsignor Michael J. Ryan, of the Archdiocese of Adelaide (Australia), is made Domestic Prelate.

16 August: Monsignor John A. Floersch, of the Diocese of Nashville, is made Honorary Chamberlain of the Pope.

17 August: Monsignor William J. Ormond, of the Diocese of Auckland (Australasia), is made Honorary Chamberlain of the Pope.

3 May: Dr. Peter G. Moylan, of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, is made Knight of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class.

DIVISION AND ERECTION OF DIOCESES.

By Apostolic Letter of 28 July, 1917, part of the Diocese of Goulburn (Australia), comprising fifteen parishes, is erected into a new Diocese with the episcopal residence at Wagga-Wagga.

By separate Apostolic Letter of the same date, twelve parishes of the archdiocesan district of Sydney are incorporated in the Diocese of Goulburn.

By Apostolic Letter of the same date, six parishes of the Diocese of Bathurst are incorporated in the Diocese of Wilcannia, which latter is to adopt the title of Wilcannia-Forbes. The Bishop of Wilcannia-Forbes is instructed to reside alternately in the City of Broken Hill and in the City of Forbes, six months of the year in each.

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALEOTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

HIS HOLINESS, POPE BENEDICT XV grants indulgences and privileges to the League of Daily Mass in the Archdiocese of New York.

HIS EMINENCE THE CARDINAL SECRETARY OF STATE enumerates certain Canons of the new Codex that become operative at once, instead of being held in abeyance until next Whitsuntide. These include the prescriptions on abstinence and fasting, the new legislation on the Easter Communion, the solemnization of marriage in forbidden times, and holidays of obligation. (The decree is discussed at greater length below.)

S. CONGREGATION ON SEMINARIES AND UNIVERSITY STUDIES requires the use of the new Code of Canon Law as a text book.

S. PENITENTIARY APOSTOLIC answers two questions about privileged altars.

ROMAN CURIA gives official list of recent pontifical appointments.

PART OF CANON LAW NOW IN FORCE.

By a document dated 20 August, 1917, the Cardinal Secretary of State declares that the Holy Father, acceding to the petition of bishops and other ordinaries, has decreed that certain provisions of the new Code of Canon Law shall be in force at once ("nulla interposita mora"). The following are the Canons as given in the original text of the Code:

I. Canon 859, No. 2. "Paschalis Communio fiat a dominica Palmarum ad dominicam in albis: sed locorum Ordinariis fas est, si ita personarum ac locorum adiuncta exigant, hoc tempus etiam pro omnibus suis fidelibus anticipare, non tamen ante quartam diem dominicam quadragesimae, vel prorogare, non tamen ultra festum sanctissimae Trinitatis."

By virtue of this enactment, bishops may, where the circumstances seem to warrant it, proclaim the time between the fourth Sunday of Lent and Trinity Sunday as the period for the performance of the Easter duty. (Cf. p. 497, of this number.)

II. Canon 1108, No. 3. Having in No. 2 of this Canon determined that the solemn blessing of nuptials is forbidden from the first Sunday of Advent to Christmas Day, inclusive, and from Ash Wednesday to Easter Sunday, inclusive, Canon 1108 proceeds in No. 3: "*Ordinarii tamen locorum possunt, salvis legibus liturgicis, etiam praedictis temporibus eam permittere ex justa causa, monitis sponsis ut a nimia pompa abstineant.*"

This decree plainly grants to bishops the power to permit the solemn blessing of a marriage within the forbidden times, provided there be no unusual pomp, provided the liturgical prescriptions be observed, and provided also there be a sufficient reason.

III. Canon 1247, No. 1. "*Dies festi sub praecepto in universa ecclesia sunt tantum: Omnes et singuli dies dominici, festa Nativitatis, Circumcisionis, Epiphaniae, Ascensionis et Sanctissimi Corporis Christi, Immaculatae Conceptionis et Assumptionis Almae Genetricis Dei Mariae, Sancti Joseph eius Sponsi, Beatorum Petri et Pauli Apostolorum, Omnium denique Sanctorum.*"

It is important, however, to note that in No. 3 the same Canon decrees: "*Sicubi aliquod festum ex enumeratis legitime sit abolitum vel translatum, nihil inconsulta Sede Apostolica innovetur.*"

IV. (1) Canon 1250. "*Abstinentiae lex vetat carne jureque ex carne vesci, non autem ovis, lacticiniis et quibuslibet condimentis etiam ex adipe animalium.*"

(2) Canon 1251. "*Lex jejunii praescribit ut nonnisi unica per diem comestio fiat; sed non vetat aliquid cibi mane et vespere sumere, servata tamen circa ciborum quantitatem et qualitatem probata locorum consuetudine.*"

No. 2. "*Nec vetitum est carnes ac pisces in eadem refec-tione permiscere; nec serotinam refectionem cum prandio permutare.*"

It will be lawful, therefore, next Lent, to eat fish and flesh at the same meal, to take the principal meal of the day at noon or in the evening, and in regard to the "collations" to conform to approved local customs.

(3) Canon 1252, No. 1. "*Lex solius abstinentiae servanda est singulis sextis feriis.*"

No. 2. "Lex abstinentiae simul et jejunii servanda est feria quarta Cinerum, feriis sextis et sabbatis Quadragesimae et feriis Quatuor Temporum, pervigiliis Pentecostes, Deiparae in Coelum Assumptae, Omnium Sanctorum et Nativitatis Domini."

No. 3. "Lex solius jejunii servanda est reliquis omnibus Quadragesimae diebus."

No. 4. "Diebus dominicis vel festis de praecepto lex abstinentiae, vel abstinentiae et jejunii, vel jejunii tantum cessat, nec pervigilia anticipantur; item cessat Sabbato Sancto post meridiem."

These provisions in regard to fasting and abstinence are clear enough. Henceforth, by general law, fast and abstinence are abolished on holidays of obligation. If a vigil falls on a holiday of obligation or on Sunday, the fast and abstinence are not anticipated. There is no fast or abstinence after noon on Easter Saturday. It is to be noted, too, that there is no mention of any fast during Advent, except, of course, on Ember Days and the Vigil of Christmas.

(4) Canon 1253. "His canonibus nihil immutatur de indultis particularibus, de votis cuiuslibet personae physicae vel moralis, de constitutionibus ac regulis cuiusvis religionis vel instituti approbati sive virorum sive mulierum in commune viventium etiam sine votis."

(5) Canon 1254, No. 1. "Abstinentiae lege tenentur omnes qui septimum aetatis annum expleverint."

No. 6. "Lege jejunii adstringuntur omnes ab expleto vicesimo primo anno ad inceptum sexagesimum."

NEWMAN'S ARGUMENT FROM CONSCIENCE FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

The following communication from Fr. Harrington was received in August. Thinking that Father Toohey might wish to make some explanation, we submitted the paper to him, with the request that if he had any comment to make, it would be desirable to have the same appear simultaneously with Father Harrington's paper in order to avoid drawing out the controversy beyond the present issue. Father Toohey's absence from Georgetown delayed the publication of the two letters.
—EDITOR.

I.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In my article in the June number of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW occurred the following paragraph: "There is one moral argument given for the existence of God that I reject as invalid, that from conscience, thought by Cardinal Newman to be the strongest of all the arguments treated by him at length in his *Grammar of Assent*. He argues from the voice of conscience to the necessary existence of a divine lawgiver. I think this argument completely worthless and even dangerous, as it has a fine tinge of Modernism about it, although Newman himself would be the last to support such a movement in Catholic philosophy. Newman argues to the existence of God because we hear His voice in our conscience, telling us certain actions are right or wrong. 'Though', he says, 'I lost my sense of the moral deformity of my acts, I should not therefore lose my sense that they were forbidden to me'. But we know that conscience speaks to us because we have a knowledge of God or His laws from other sources; for example, that certain things are wrong, intrinsically evil, against the natural law, and certain things are wrong because they are prohibited to us, whereas if they are not prohibited to us, our reason could see nothing in them but good. Therefore a knowledge of the morality of the act must precede the sting of conscience, not *vice versa*. Conscience is not an inner sense by which we perceive religious truths. This is the doctrine of Schleiermacher. It is Newman's theory pressed to its logical conclusion. It finds expression in the subconscious immanence of the Modernists, and in practice it opens wide the door to every kind of religious extravagance."

Father Toohey, S.J., writing in the August number of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW makes a few comments on this passage which show, I think, that he has missed the point of my argument against Newman's proof, perhaps because my analysis of the argument from conscience as given by Newman was too condensed; and it therefore gives me the greatest pleasure to correct any false impression I may have made in the mind of Father Toohey, or of any other of my readers.

1. The moral argument for the existence of God that I rejected as invalid, was the one given by Newman. The reason

for rejecting it was that Newman holds that one can lose one's sense of the moral deformity of one's acts and at the same time retain one's sense that these same acts are forbidden. Now I hold that this is not possible, and experience proves that it is not. On the contrary I hold that, if one has no sense of the moral deformity of one's acts, one's conscience would never upbraid him. A knowledge of the morality of the act must precede the announcement by conscience that it is forbidden. Otherwise how could conscience forbid it? Or where did it get the knowledge that it was forbidden? The intellect can get knowledge of the immorality of acts in two ways: either by seeing that they are intrinsically evil, or because they are prohibited by an external lawgiver. But since the intellect does not see their moral deformity and still, according to Newman, the conscience could know that they were forbidden, conscience would seem to be some faculty independent of the intellect, and acting blindly. But conscience in the broadest sense is only the intellect viewed as perceiving good and evil; more exactly, it is an act of the practical reason, a practical judgment of the understanding. Therefore, I said, conscience is not an *inner sense* by which we perceive religious truths, and Newman's theory pressed to its logical conclusion does make it something independent of the intellect, and capable of obtaining knowledge of the forbidden nature of the act, while the mind is in ignorance of the morality of the same act, and here is the element of *subjectivity* that seems to me to vitiate this theory of conscience and makes any argument for the existence of God drawn from it absolutely invalid. Once such a theory of conscience was admitted, it is easy to see how in practice it would lead to almost any kind of religious extravagance.

2. As to Father Toohey's comments on the passage of my article just quoted, and explained, he says the argument from conscience, as employed by Newman, and many scholastic authors, bears no relation whatever, even the remotest, to the subconscious immanence of the Modernists; and then Father Toohey goes on to give an ethical argument of his own which does not contain the subjective element that I have objected to in Newman's version of the argument from conscience at all, and concludes by saying that the argument from conscience,

as he states it himself, has not a tinge of Modernism about it. But I was criticizing Newman's version of the argument from conscience, not Father Toohey's, and therefore to this part of his objection we say, *Transeat*. Again, Father Toohey misses the point when he says that, starting with the dictates of conscience, we can arrive at the knowledge of many natural truths of religion as distinguished from supernatural truths. *Concedo*. My contention is not that conscience cannot perceive religious truths but that conscience is not an *inner sense* or *faculty* or whatever else he wishes to call it, which perceives religious truths while the intellect remains ignorant of their moral goodness or deformity. I was arguing against that passage quoted literally, by Father Toohey from the *Grammar of Assent* (page 106), where Newman writes, "Though I lost my sense of the obligation which I lie under, to abstain from acts of dishonesty, I should not in consequence lose my sense that such actions were an outrage offered to my moral nature. Again, though I lost my sense of their moral deformity, I should not therefore lose my sense that they were forbidden to me." Criticizing this last sentence of Newman, I wrote: "But we know that conscience speaks to us because we have a knowledge of God or His laws from other sources; for example, that certain things are wrong, intrinsically evil, against the natural law, and certain things are wrong because they are prohibited to us, whereas if they are not prohibited to us, our reason could see nothing in them but good." Father Toohey says that this sentence, unless it is qualified, is not true, because he understands me to say that we cannot know from conscience that certain things are intrinsically evil, unless we have a knowledge of God, or His laws, from other sources. My sentence, however, says distinctly, that we have two ways of knowing evil. Evil that is intrinsic and against the natural law, and evil that may not be intrinsically so, but evil because prohibited. That is the reason why conscience speaks to us of evil on my theory, and it is a fundamental doctrine of Christian ethics.

But why conscience should speak to us of evil at all, while the intellect does not perceive its deformity, either as intrinsic evil, or evil merely because the thing is prohibited, is what I cannot square with the fundamental principle of Christian

ethics, that we can know certain actions are intrinsically evil whether we know that God has prohibited them or not.

Dr. Cronin, the distinguished Professor of Ethics at the National University of Ireland, gives a scholarly refutation of Newman's argument from conscience, which is worth quoting in full:

As from a multitude of initiative perceptions, writes Cardinal Newman, acting in particular instances, of something beyond the senses, we generalize the notion of an external world, and then picture that world in and according to the particular phenomena from which we started, so from the perceptive power which identifies the intimations of conscience with the reverberations or echoes (so to say) of an external admonition, we proceed on to the notion of a Supreme Ruler and Judge, and then again we image Him and His attributes in those recurring intimations, *out of which, as mental phenomena, our recognition of His existence was originally gained.*¹

We reply: It is because we know *aliunde* the existence of God and know also *aliunde* that the intimations of conscience *represent* the Divine Will, that therefore we conclude that the objective moral relations revealed by conscience are commands of God—commands, that is, of a ruler who is all perfect, wise, just, powerful, of One who is not indifferent toward His own laws, but who as Creator of that very order which conscience reveals to us, is offended and pained at its violation by those who owe him all the love that He may claim from them. But could we *per impossibile* imagine a state of civilization in which men have not as yet thought about the existence of God, and consequently have as yet no idea of Him, then, indeed, would all this sacredness, of which Newman speaks, be gone from conscience—the sense, that is, of a loving Father offended, a personal majesty outraged, of a trust betrayed. We cannot agree, therefore, with Cardinal Newman, when he writes: "Though I lost my sense of the moral deformity of my acts, I should not, therefore, lose my sense that they were forbidden to me"—meaning that Conscience reveals to me, first and before all things, not that an act is bad, but that an act is forbidden to us—the badness being only an inference from the prohibition. This, indeed, is the plain summing up of the theory of conscience—the voice of God. And it is disproved by ordinary experience. For, apart from Revelation, it is not possible to know what acts God forbids unless our reasoning first shows them to be bad; again, the consequences to which this theory leads have already been pointed out. For instance, if prohibition be the sole source of

¹ *Grammar of Assent* (page 104).

my knowledge of evil, it is impossible that I should be able to distinguish between acts which God prohibits because He *must*, and acts which he prohibits because He freely wills to do so. But we can and do make such distinctions. Therefore, that acts are bad is known on other grounds than those of divine prohibition. In conscience, therefore, we find no proof of God's existence.²

Doctor Moyes of Westminster, writes :

God or righteousness in some shape has first of all to be reached by reason, before reason, which we call conscience, can dictate its practical judgment. Conscience thus postulates God or Goodness rather than reveals them. . . . The distinction has its importance in the fact that the practical judgment of conscience takes its direction from a speculative judgment of reason, which precedes it. . . . The sense of right and wrong—of the duty of doing what God wills, or what is Godward or right, and of avoiding what God forbids, or what is ungodward or wrong—is not so much the cause, as the resultant, and not so much the premiss, as the conclusion, of the reason perceiving that God is, and that certain actions make for or against Him.³

Newman used other arguments to prove the existence of God, as those from the order in the visible universe and for a first cause. Therefore we have never doubted his orthodoxy, as we were careful to note before criticizing his argument. But because Newman used this argument from conscience to which I have objected, is no reason why the prestige of his great name should prevent us from placing after it a point of interrogation. If St Thomas had used it, we might have used the same liberty. I am well aware of the attempts of the Modernists to connect the name of Newman with their cause, attempts that were settled forever in the brilliant defence by the Bishop of Limerick, which drew an autograph letter from Pius X, and therefore it is that, though my strictures on his argument from Conscience for the existence of God appear rather severe, still it is far from my intention to cast any aspersion on the great and venerable name of John Henry Cardinal Newman.

J. C. HARRINGTON.

St. Paul, Minnesota.

² *The Science of Ethics*: Cronin. Vol. I, pp. 476-477.

³ Moyes, *The Existence of God*, pp. 43, 44, 45.

II.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

I wish to thank Father Harrington for his courteous letter and to say that I am exceedingly sorry at having misconstrued his meaning in one or two sentences. It would serve no useful purpose to explain how I came to misunderstand him, and so I shall not attempt to do it.

In a letter which was published in the London *Tablet* for 25 April, 1908, I said: "I have no stomach for controversy, and I never should have written had I not felt there was a call upon me to do so. . . . All true admirers of the Cardinal will be deeply grateful to the Most Rev. Bishop of Limerick for the masterly essay which was the occasion of the Holy Father's letter of approbation. This essay has rendered all further defence of Newman superfluous; and, with the present letter, my connexion with this discussion shall come to an end." These words were uttered in all sincerity. I have an extreme aversion to public controversy, particularly with a Catholic priest. In one's effort to be brief, it is so exceedingly difficult to avoid misunderstandings and to keep from giving offence. I am sure that Father Harrington will believe me when I say that there is absolutely nothing personal in what I shall write, and that I sincerely hope he will find nothing in my remarks to offend him. And I am confident he will appreciate my position when I say that with the present letter I shall withdraw from the discussion. We are both anxious to arrive at the truth in the matter before us, and neither of us is seeking for a personal victory.

I did not write in the August issue of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW to demonstrate the cogency of the argument from conscience, but to show that there is nothing Modernistic in Newman's development of the argument. Scholastic writers are divided as to its cogency. Some of the acutest minds that I have met among Scholastic philosophers look upon it as an extremely powerful argument. But let that pass. The only question before us is this: Does Newman's use of the argument savor of Modernism?

Father Harrington says: "[I think Father Toohey] has missed the point of my argument against Newman's proof." Father Harrington and Dr. Cronin will pardon me if I say that

I think they have missed the point of Newman's argument from conscience.

In the letter to the *Tablet* to which I referred a moment ago, I wrote: "There is a danger of our expecting from Newman a continual metaphysical exactness of expression such as the Scholastics themselves do not exemplify. To arrive at a true understanding of an author's meaning, we must not fix our sole attention upon isolated passages from his writings; we must contemplate these passages in their proper context, and we shall best learn the author's own interpretation of his words by studying the examples which he uses in illustration." Newman himself says: "Anything is startling and grotesque, if taken out of its place, and surveyed without reference to the whole to which it belongs."¹

To show how easy it is to misinterpret a writer's meaning, I will take the following words from Father Harrington's letter: "I hold that if one has no sense of the moral deformity of one's acts, one's conscience would never upbraid him." Supposing this sentence, unaccompanied by its context, were to fall under the eye of a person who is accustomed to use the word "sense" in the rigorous technical meaning in which it is employed in Scholastic philosophy: he might be led to remark as follows: "The word 'sense' can be applied only to our animal nature. Hence, Father Harrington seems to imply that we ought to have in our animal nature a sense of the moral deformity of our acts, and that the perception of moral objects belongs to the same order as the sense of hunger and the sense of thirst. There is something distinctly Modernistic in this contention." Now, anyone who had read Father Harrington's letter would know that the foregoing comment on his words was absolutely false; he would know that Father Harrington was using the word "sense" in the same meaning as that in which Newman had used it, namely, as an intellectual perception.

Newman's *Grammar of Assent*, in which is found the argument from conscience, is not addressed to Scholastic philosophers, but to the ordinary educated man who is unfamiliar with the technical language of the Schoolmen. Accordingly,

¹ *Present Position*, p. 331.

Newman employs the words of everyday speech, and these words he employs for the most part in a sense which is sanctioned by common usage. Sometimes he seems to use the word "conscience" in the sense of an intellectual perceptive power, but almost always he uses it in the sense of an act or exercise of this power; and very frequently he employs the word "sense", and at times the word "feeling", to denote the act of conscience.

I shall confine my remarks to the following quotations from Father Harrington and Dr. Cronin:

Father Harrington: I hold that if one has no sense of the moral deformity of one's acts, one's conscience would never upbraid him. A knowledge of the morality of the act must precede the announcement by conscience that it is forbidden . . . [According to Newman] conscience would seem to be some faculty independent of the intellect, and acting blindly. . . . Newman's theory pressed to its logical conclusion does make it [conscience] something independent of the intellect, and capable of obtaining knowledge of the forbidden nature of the act, while the mind is in ignorance of the morality of the same act.

Dr. Cronin: We cannot agree, therefore, with Cardinal Newman when he writes: "Though I lost my sense of the moral deformity of my acts, I should not, therefore, lose my sense that they were forbidden to me"—meaning that Conscience reveals to me, first and before all things, not that an act is bad, but that an act is forbidden to us—the badness being only an inference from the prohibition.²

These statements of Father Harrington and Dr. Cronin are conclusions which they draw from the following words of Newman: "Though I lost my sense of the obligation which I lie under to abstain from acts of dishonesty, I should not in consequence lose my sense that such actions were an outrage offered to my moral nature. Again; though I lost my sense of their moral deformity, I should not therefore lose my sense that they were forbidden to me."³

I remark upon these words of Newman as follows:

First: Suppose that, instead of confining our attention to the second sentence from Newman, as Dr. Cronin does, we were to

² *Ethics*, p. 477.

³ *Grammar*, p. 106.

fix our gaze solely upon the first; then our criticism would run as follows: "We cannot agree, therefore, with Cardinal Newman when he writes: 'Though I lost my sense of the obligation which I lie under to abstain from acts of dishonesty, I should not in consequence lose my sense that such actions were an outrage offered to my moral nature'—meaning that Conscience reveals to me, first and before all things, not that an act is forbidden to us, but that an act is bad—the prohibition being only an inference from the badness." This interpretation of Newman's doctrine is as fully warranted as is Dr. Cronin's.

Secondly: Suppose the word "lose" to have its most common literal meaning in the foregoing passage from Newman; then it is impossible to lose what one does not possess. To say that a person can lose his sense of the moral deformity of acts of dishonesty implies that he *has* that sense.

Thirdly: The whole context shows that Newman does not mean that we can *literally* lose our sense of the moral deformity of acts of dishonesty while we retain our sense that they are forbidden; much less does he anywhere say that anyone *literally does* lose or *has lost* the former while retaining the latter; and he certainly does not base his argument from conscience upon either of these suppositions. Father Harrington's criticism would be warranted only on the hypothesis that Newman had based his argument upon the second supposition. On the contrary, Newman says that the act or feeling of conscience, which is at once a sense of moral deformity and of prohibition, is *indivisible*. His words are as follows: "The feeling of conscience . . . is twofold: it is a moral sense, and a sense of duty; a judgment of the reason and a magisterial dictate. *Of course* its act is *indivisible*; still it has these two aspects, distinct from each other, and admitting of a separate consideration."⁴ Again: "These emotions constitute a specific difference between conscience and our other intellectual senses—common sense, good sense, sense of expedience, taste, sense of honour, and the like—as indeed they would also constitute between conscience and the moral sense, supposing these two were not aspects of *one and the same* feeling, exercised upon *one and the same* subject-matter."⁵

⁴ *Grammar*, pp. 105-6.

⁵ P. 108.

Since, then, according to Newman, the sense of the moral deformity of acts of dishonesty and the sense that they are forbidden are aspects of *one and the same* act, and since he claims that this act is *indivisible*, it is obvious that he does not hold that the sense of the moral deformity of acts of dishonesty can be *literally* and *really* lost, while the sense that they are forbidden remains. If two aspects of one and the same act are *indivisible*, how can they be divided? and must they not be divided in order *literally* to lose one without losing the other? The passage from Newman upon which Father Harrington and Dr. Cronin have animadverted follows immediately after the quotation given above beginning with the words "The feeling of conscience"; and it is a further elucidation of these words; it surely cannot be interpreted in such a way as to make it contradict the words which immediately precede it. What Newman is insisting on is that the indivisible act of conscience has two aspects, that these aspects "admit of a separate consideration," and that when, for a given purpose, we are contemplating one of these aspects, we are not necessarily contemplating the other. Man is rational, and he is an animal. His rationality is indivisible from his animality; but they are distinct aspects of one and the same being; they "admit of a separate consideration;" and when we contemplate man as an animal, we do not necessarily contemplate him as rational. The whole context shows that in Newman's meaning the word "lose" has the same force as "prescind from" or "abstract from" or "lose sight of". Substitute "prescind from" for "lose" in the passage criticized by Father Harrington and Dr. Cronin, and you will find that the passage is a luminous commentary on the words immediately preceding. Newman is not formally engaged in proving the existence of God,⁶ but in showing how "the mind arrives, not only at a notional, but at a . . . real assent to the doctrine that there is One God."⁷ And in order to do this, he wishes to make clear that there are two aspects to the indivisible act of conscience, and that when he is dwelling upon one of these aspects, he is not dwelling upon the other, because he does not claim that

⁶ Cf. pp. 99 and 104.

⁷ P. 119.

the other aspect helps us to arrive at a *real* assent to the doctrine that there is One God. He does not wish these two aspects to be confused in his treatment of the subject; and they might very easily be confused, if he had not insisted upon the distinction between them.

Father Harrington says: "If one has no sense of the moral deformity of one's acts, one's conscience would never upbraid him." Newman says nothing contrary to this; if we suppose that he does, we make nonsense out of the whole chapter in which he treats of the argument from conscience, and the chapter becomes a tissue of contradictions. A few quotations will suffice to make Newman's position clear. "Conscience is ever forcing on us by threats and by promises that we must follow the right and avoid the wrong" (p. 106). But how can conscience force on us by *threats* and by *promises* that we must follow the right and avoid the wrong, unless it supposes that we *know* what is right and what is wrong? Again: "The child keenly *understands* that there is a difference between right and wrong; and *when* he *has done* what he *believes* to be wrong, he is conscious that he is offending One to whom he is amenable" (p. 112). Again: "Knowledge must ever *precede* the exercise of the affections. We feel gratitude and love, we feel indignation and dislike, *when* we *have* the *informations* actually put before us which *are to* kindle those several emotions" (p. 120). Again: "It seems a truism to say, yet it is all that I have been saying, that in religion the imagination and affections should always be under the control of reason" (p. 121). Again: "Sentiment, whether imaginative or emotional, falls back upon the intellect for its stay" (p. 121).

Since the act of conscience has two aspects, and since the word "conscience" is applied to each of these aspects, and since Newman, while claiming all along that these two aspects are always present in the act of conscience, nevertheless wishes to be understood as speaking principally of one of the aspects, therefore, he says that, when he uses the word "conscience," he desires his readers to remember that he is referring to that aspect and not to the other. When he uses the word "conscience," he does not wish to be continually calling attention to the two applications of the word.

St. Thomas says: "Dicitur conscientia testificari, ligare vel instigare vel etiam accusare vel etiam remordere sive reprehendere".⁸ Noldin:⁹ "Conscientia tum *voluntas Dei* tum *vox Dei* vulgo neque inepte appellatur . . . Conscientia . . . dividitur *ratione actuum*, ad quos refertur, in *antecedentem* et *consequentem*, prouti actus aut mox ponendi aut jam positi sunt: illa judicat quid bonum vel malum, quid faciendum vel omittendum sit, haec actum praeteritum approbat vel accusat. . . . Judicium approbans dicitur *testimonium* conscientiae; judicium accusans et reprobans *remorsus* seu vermis conscientiae." (Italics his).

Father Harrington writes: "[According to Newman] conscience would seem to be some faculty independent of the intellect, and acting blindly . . . Newman's theory pressed to its logical conclusion does make it [conscience] something independent of the intellect." So far is Newman from supposing conscience to be a faculty independent of the intellect, that he says exactly the opposite, as a few extracts from the *Grammar of Assent* will be sufficient to show. Newman says: "I assume, then, that conscience has a legitimate place among our *mental acts*" (p. 105). Again: "Conscience is ever forcing on us by threats and by promises that we must follow the right and avoid the wrong; so far it is one and the same in the *mind* of every one" (pp. 106-7). Again: "These emotions constitute a specific difference between conscience and our *other intellectual* senses,—common sense, good sense, sense of expedience" (p. 108).

There is one passage in the *Grammar of Assent* which may seem to give a semblance of plausibility to Dr. Cronin's interpretation of Newman. It is as follows: "Let us then consider conscience, not as a rule of right conduct, but as a sanction of right conduct. This is its primary and most authoritative aspect; it is the ordinary sense of the word. Half the world would be puzzled to know what was meant by the moral sense; but every one knows what is meant by a good or bad conscience" (p. 106). If we construe the word "primary" so as to make Newman mean that, in one's consciousness, con-

⁸ I. q. 79, a. 3.

⁹ *De Principiis Theologiae Moralis*, edit. 6ta, p. 220.

science as a sanction is prior in time or prior in nature or *in signo rationis priore* to conscience as a rule, we make Newman contradict himself. Murray's *New English Dictionary* (Oxford) gives "principal" and "chief" as synonyms of "primary". The context shows Newman's meaning to be that when the word "conscience" is mentioned, the principal aspect it calls up before our minds is that it is a sanction of right conduct. He says "it is the ordinary sense of the word." And he continues: "Half the world would be puzzled to know what was *meant* by the [*words*] moral sense; but every one knows what is *meant* by [*the words*] a good or bad conscience." And it is to be observed that, when Newman is explaining the distinction between conscience as a rule and conscience as a sanction, he invariably puts conscience as a rule in the first place.

In explaining the distinction between the two aspects of the act of conscience Newman employs the following expressions as synonymous with reference to the first aspect: "moral sense," "judgment of the reason," "critical office of conscience," "testimony of conscience," "conscience as a rule of right conduct." And this same aspect in regard to evil acts he calls the "sense that such actions were an outrage offered to my moral nature" and the "sense of their moral deformity." In reference to the second aspect he uses the following expressions as synonymous: "sense of duty," "magisterial dictate," "judicial office of conscience," "sanction of conscience," "conscience as a sanction of right conduct." And this second aspect with respect to evil acts he calls the "sense of the obligation which I lie under to abstain" and the "sense that they were forbidden to me."

I should remark here, by way of parenthesis, that I am responsible for the italics in the quotations I have made from Newman.

In the beginning of his *Spiritual Exercises* St. Ignatius lays down a rule of criticism which it is not always easy to follow in practice, but which ought certainly to be kept in mind when we are interpreting the words of another. These are his words: "Supponendum est, Christianum unumquemque pium, debere promptiore animo sententiam seu propositionem obscuram alterius in bonam trahere partem, quam damnare."

The present discussion proves that I have not myself always accommodated my conduct to this golden rule of St. Ignatius.

Here I bring to an end my own part in this discussion, though I have not said one-tenth of what I might say on the subject of it. In conclusion, I wish to apologize to the Very Reverend Editor for taking up so much space which could have been devoted to more important and interesting matters.

JOHN J. TOOHEY, S.J.

Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.

BENEDICTION WITH CIBORIUM.

Qu. Is it lawful to give Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament with the ciborium to the members of a catechism class in the church, using only the surplice and stole and no incense?

Resp. In poorer churches, where there is no ostensorium, or monstrance, Benediction may be given with the ciborium. Apart from this case, the custom is tolerated if the bishop of the diocese sanctions it. The priest wears a surplice and white stole. He opens the tabernacle door, so that the faithful may see the ciborium, which should be covered with its veil. After the "Tantum ergo", he receives the humeral veil, ascends the steps of the altar, genuflects, receives the ciborium, covers it with the corners of the humeral veil, and gives the Benediction in the usual manner. Although the instructions do not mention the use of incense, it seems that incense should be used in the same manner as in Benediction with the ostensorium. It is to be noted that the S. Congregation expressly forbids the use of the alb and cincture in place of the surplice. (Decree 3697, ad XII.)

PASTOR'S ABSENCE FROM HIS PARISH.

Qu. How long may a parish priest absent himself from his parish? Does he always require the permission of his bishop, and should it be in writing?

Resp. The Council of Trent decrees that a parish priest may be absent from his parish for two months, "aequa ex causa et absque ullo gregis detrimento." The Sacred Congregation of the Council by numerous responses has estab-

lished the rule that even for an absence of less than two months a parish priest requires the written permission of his bishop. If it is impossible, owing to the urgency of the reason for his absence, and the distance of the episcopal city, to obtain such permission, the pastor is obliged to notify his superior, and explain the reason of his absence. Theologians maintained that, if the absence be for less than a week, a written permission is not necessary; this opinion, however, was based on the general law of the matter, and did not exclude the possibility that by *jus particulare*, that is, by diocesan statute, a written permission may be required for any absence, however brief. The new Code of Canon Law confirms, by inference, the negative opinion. Canon 465, No. 4, says that, if the absence is *for more than a week*, written permission is required. In No. 6 of the same Canon the pastor is reminded that even when his absence is for a briefer period he must provide for the spiritual needs of his people.

PRIEST ASSISTING AT REMARRIAGE AFTER DIVORCE.

Qu. Does not the following decision militate against the opinion expressed on page 320, September number, more especially (2),

"Incolae infideles insularum Samoa, quando volunt verum et firmum matrimonium contrahere, necessarium putant pactum nuptiale inire praesente aliquo ministro religionis, vel consule, ut appellari solet, alicujus nationis. Neque tamen hujusmodi testes praesentia ullius legis praescripto exigitur, sed solum ipsi incolae opinione suam ad matrimonii firmitatem requiri sibi persuaderunt. Quaeritur jam utrum liceat missionariis catholicis tamquam testibus rogatis adesse celebrationi hujusmodi foederum nuptiarum.

"R . . . Missionarios in casu proposito propter graves causas, si bonum religionis catholicae id postulet, posse exhibere suam praesentiam matrimoniis inter infideles, dummodo (1) ex omnibus adjunctis appareant, vel etiam declarent expresse, se assistere nullatenus tamquam fungentes munere sacro, sed mere ut testes et spectatores contractus naturalis; dummodo (2) sufficienter constet nullum impedimentum et nullum pactum intervenire quod reddat matrimonium invalidum, nihilque admisceatur superstitiosum, aut quod falsum cultum redolet; et dummodo (3) absit omnis ratio scandali." (S. C. C. 1 Dec. 1864).

Resp. There is no doubt at all that a priest *may* assist at the "remarriage" of a couple after divorce. It is a question

of expediency, namely whether, as a general policy, he *should* assist at a contract of the kind. We said in the September number, on the page to which our correspondent refers, that we knew of no law of the Church "that would oblige him to refuse to act," and referred to what we considered the danger of an erroneous public opinion being formed in regard to the Sacrament of Matrimony. There is nothing in the decree cited by our correspondent that may be said to militate against the remarks made in the September number.

CANTICLE "BENEDICITE" AFTER MASS.

Qu. Is there an obligation to recite the "Benedicite" after Mass? May the priest omit it?

Resp. In the *Ritus Celebrandi Missam* prefixed to the Roman Missal we read, "Redit ad sacristiam, interim dicens antiphonam *Trium Puerorum* et canticum *Benedicite*". It is a question among theologians whether this is a preceptive or only a directive rubric. Theologians agree that the prayers before and after Mass, since they are to be recited "pro opportunitate sacerdotis," are not of precept, and others may be substituted for them. On the contrary, the prayers prescribed for recitation during the act of vesting are by the majority of theologians held to be prescribed *sub levi*. As to the canticle "Benedicite", there is, as we just said, a diversity of opinion, which justified Lehmkuhl, for instance, in his conclusion that, "qui alias preces devotius recitat, hac commutatione non peccat".

SHOULD DEAD PRIEST BE VESTED IN BLACK CHASUBLE?

Qu. When a priest says a Requiem Mass for others, he wears a black chasuble. When he is dead and others are saying Mass for him, should he not be vested in a black chasuble also? Black is surely the appropriate color, unless he has kept the chasuble in which he was ordained. Why a priest should be dressed in any other color than black, when his body is laid out for burial, is not clear, but in some places it is customary to use a violet chasuble.

Resp. The Roman Ritual, Tit. VI, De Exsequiis, n. 11, prescribes: "Sacerdos (defunctus) super talarem vestem, amictu, alba, cingulo, manipulo, stola et casula, seu planeta

violacea sit indutus". There is, however, an interpretation of this rubric by the S. Congregation of Rites which sanctions the custom of using a black instead of a violet or purple chasuble. In 1908 the following Dubium was proposed, "An, vi consuetudinis, liceat cadavera sacerdotum induere casula seu planeta nigri coloris?" The answer, dated 20 November, 1908 (Decree n. 4228) was: "Affirmative, attenta praesertim consuetudine et Rubrica Ritualis Romani, quae praescribens paramenta violacea in casu non excludit nigra". We should say, then, that the use of violet or purple vestments in the case has at least as much authority as the use of black vestments. As regards the greater appropriateness of either color, there is room for difference of opinion. Each liturgical color has its symbolic meaning. "Light and color, among material things, are the nearest related to the spiritual."¹ Black is, of course, the color associated with death and sorrow; purple has many associated suggestions in the liturgical use of it "pro quacumque necessitate", "pro iter facientibus," in penitential seasons, in seasons of special prayer or impetration, etc. Perhaps the Church wishes that in the funeral obsequies of the priest sorrow should, in the liturgical arrangements, be merged in sentiments which are prompted by the sacerdotal character of the deceased.

FORMAL OBJECT OF DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART.

Qu. Is the formal object of the devotion to the Sacred Heart the created love of Jesus, or His infinite divine love, or both?

Resp. In a recent work, *The Theology of the Cultus of the Sacred Heart*, offered by Dr. Petrovits as a Doctor's Dissertation, and published by the Catholic University of America, the author, after reciting the opinions of various pious and learned authorities, concludes in favor of the third opinion, namely, that both the created and the uncreated love of Christ are the formal object of devotion to the Sacred Heart. This contention, he warns us, "is not to be interpreted as advocating the fusion of the two loves into one. On the contrary, the investigation as a whole is calculated to bring out in clear relief the particular excellence and domain of each

¹ Gehr, *Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, p. 298.

love. It may, however, be contended that, whereas there is no particular reason for such a definite separation, and, whereas the faithful mean to worship the entire love of the Divine Person to whom their homages are paid, the two loves ought to be as one united formal object of devotion " (p. 127).

THE "ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS."

Qu. Has the Index of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* the force of law? When, in the Index, or Table of Contents, I find a proposition the sense of which is complete, has that sentence binding force in conscience?

Resp. The new Code of Canon Law reaffirms the authority of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* as a medium for the official promulgation of the legislative acts of the Holy See. As has been pointed out more than once in these pages, the decrees of the Holy See do not require episcopal or other local promulgation. After they have been officially published, they are presumed to reach the faithful throughout the world, by means which may be official or unofficial. In most cases, a term of three months after publication is allowed before the necessity arises of *proving* one's ignorance of the law. The Index or Table of Contents of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* we take to be unofficial. When one reads there that on such and such a page of a certain volume there is a law prohibiting or prescribing or permitting a certain action, it is the same as if one read in the daily papers that such a law was promulgated in a certain number of the *Acta*. It must, however, be added that the Index is more likely to be correct in the matter than the daily paper. For an authentic and accurate understanding of the law one should, of course, not be content with a résumé in either index or newspaper, but should go to the original document in the *Acta* or a reprint or translation that has some guarantee of accuracy.

IS THIS CEMETERY BLESSED?

Qu. Shortly after having bought a new cemetery for the parish of X in the diocese of Y, its pastor permitted the body of a bigamist and public sinner who was buried in the Potter's field of the Catholic cemetery of R in the diocese of D to be removed to the new cemetery

of X and buried there. A few days afterward the bishop of Y, in perfect good faith, blessed the new cemetery, never thinking that the validity of his act might be doubted. Is the cemetery really blessed?

Resp. The fact that the body of the public sinner was buried in the Potter's field of the cemetery at R does not prove that the deceased was not entitled to burial in a Catholic cemetery. At least, we are not in a position to judge whether, at the last, the sinner did not give some outward sign of repentance. The new Code of Canon Law (Canon 1240) provides that, even in the case of notorious apostates and excommunicated persons *aliqua poenitentiae signa* given before death entitle the deceased to ecclesiastical burial. In any case, when he was interred in the new cemetery that cemetery was not consecrated nor blessed. The pastor of the parish of X was probably convinced that the deceased had given some sign of repentance. If he were in doubt, he should have informed his bishop. We should judge that he was in good faith as well as the bishop, and we see no reason why the blessing by the bishop may be said to be in any way irregular or devoid of effect.

REPEATING EXTREME UNCTION.

Qu. In my parish there are two patients; one has been ill for more than four years, the other for seven months. The former received the last rites of the Church three years ago; the latter, six months ago. According to theology, certain conditions must be fulfilled before the Sacrament of Extreme Unction can be repeated, and, so far as I can judge, these conditions are wanting in the present cases. It is the same disease, the same danger of death; the parties have not recovered for any reasonable length of time. What is to be done?

Resp. The law of the Church in regard to repeating the Sacrament of Extreme Unction is reaffirmed in the new Code of Canon Law (Canon 940, No. 2). "In eadem infirmitate hoc Sacramentum iterari non potest, nisi infirmus post susceptam unctionem convaluerit, et in aliud vitae discrimen inciderit." The wording is almost identical with that of the Council of Trent, Sess. XIV, *De Extrema Unctione*, Cap. 3, and of the Roman Ritual, Tit. V, Cap. 1, No. 14. There is, however, an important difference. The words of the Roman

Ritual are: "In eadem infirmitate hoc Sacramentum iterari non debet, *nisi diuturna sit*, ut si, cum infirmus convaluerit iterum in periculum mortis incidat". The italicized words seemed to justify the opinion that the duration of the illness was in itself a sufficient reason for repeating Extreme Unction, and the recovery and new danger of death were by way of example. Indeed, the opinion of St. Thomas is cited in favor of repeating the Sacrament in the case of prolonged illness. His reason is "*reliquiae peccatorum in diuturna infirmitate contrahuntur, contra quas principaliter sacramentum datur*".¹ This opinion, says Sabetti-Barrett, is not devoid of support among theologians. In practice, therefore, while the mere fact of duration of sickness may not be made the reason for repeating the Sacrament, whenever there is doubt as to whether an improvement in the condition of the patient, followed by a relapse, justifies the repetition of the Sacrament, the priest should not, as Sabetti-Barrett puts it, be "too anxious",² but should incline to what we may call a benign interpretation of the conditions in the case. The problem is quite different from that of repeating a Sacrament like Baptism, which, once validly conferred, may not under any circumstances be repeated.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF WEARING THE SCAPULARS.

In December 1910 Pope Pius X, at the urgent request of some missionaries, permitted the substitution of a medal for the cloth scapulars in common use. The reason was plain. There are occasions and conditions which render the use of cloth scapulars a hindrance rather than a help to devotion as well as to health and convenience.

While a medal in such circumstances serves as a sufficient indication of affiliation to a religious society, it does not carry with it the significance which attaches to a garment or habit. The latter is a sort of uniform indicating a certain well defined observance as a member of a religious family or pious confraternity, and as such speaks to the wearer much more distinctly of his or her privileges and obligations than a little

¹ *Suppl.* XXXIII, 2.

² *Compendium Theologiae Moralis*, N. 828, Q. 4.

piece of metal the particular purpose of which may easily be lost sight of.

Moreover, the medal lacks not only the special significance of the separate scapulars, but also their force as a mark of profession of Catholic faith. Since medals are frequently worn, not merely as objects of devotion but as tags of association with lodges, military and social clubs, business exchanges, or for kindred purposes of identification, it is easy to mistake or pass by their special importance at critical moments where the scapular would serve as a very definite mark of identification. We would urge a restoring of the scapulars in many cases in which they are being dispensed with at present by Catholics who could easily and with profit retain the sacred vesture of religious association. This would be entirely in accord with the intention of the Pontiff who, in admitting the medal, wrote: "Vehementer exopto eadem (scapularia) quo hucusque modo consueverunt, fideles deferre prosequantur."

The following note from a recent issue of the *Ave Maria* illustrates our point of view on the subject:

While the wisdom of the Church in allowing, a few years ago, the substitution of the scapular medal for the oldtime cloth scapular worn over the shoulders was called in question by nobody, not all Catholics availed themselves of the privilege of making the substitution. Older persons especially felt disinclined to give up the habit of years, and, despite the greater convenience, etc., of the medal, kept on wearing the little cloth squares connected by the parallel strings. Now comes a chaplain of the U. S. Army with a well-reasoned appeal in favor of scapulars for our soldiers. "When a wounded soldier," says Father Waring, of the Eleventh Cavalry, "is brought to the army doctors, the first thing done is to remove all the clothing. A scapular medal carried in a pocket or a purse, or even pinned to the clothing, would never be seen; or, if seen later on, the delay would be fatal. Now, if the wounded man wore scapulars, they would be found on him after his clothing was removed. Then it would be evident to the doctors and nurses that the unconscious man was a Catholic. 'The things hanging around the neck' is what most doctors call them; but when they see them they know that they indicate a Roman Catholic."

The same reasons hold good for our sailors; and they seem to warrant the substitution, during the war at least, of the scapular for the medal.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

RECENT BIBLE STUDY.

CHRISTOLOGICAL THEORIES 26.

RITSCHLIANISM 2.

The origin of Ritschlianism, and its fundamental principle of value-judgments, *Werturtheilen*, we have already discussed.¹

I. Ritschl's anti-Bauer Period. Ritschl had been captivated by the Bauer theory of a Christ-party in the Corinthian Church, opposed to Paul;² and of a consequent Pauline revolt from the Petrine Church,³ culminating in the establishment of Paulinity in the stead of Christianity.⁴ Ritschl's eyes were opened by the destructive extravagances of Bauer's *Paulus*;⁵ his antagonism was aroused by the arbitrariness of Schwegler's *The Post-Apostolic Age in the Main Outlines of its Evolution*.⁶ Schwegler strove to lay down a clear line of demarcation between Bauer's two trumped-up parties of the early Church,—the Petrine which failed, and the Pauline which triumphed. In reply to his gratuitous theory, Ritschl wrote *The Origin of the Early Catholic Church*.⁷ This monograph on the history of the Church and her dogmas he seven years later issued in a second edition that was aimed chiefly against Bauer.

1. *Strength of Ritschl against Bauer*. The strong point scored by Ritschl is the proof that Bauer has pushed too far his fancied opposition between Jewish and Gentile converts to Christianity. Little differences of discipline have been writ large; and, by the usual process of progressive assertion, have in the end bulked big, as if irreconcilable doctrines. Had two such parties been fully organized in a doctrinal antagonism, they never would have come so readily together; there would have been an evolution *pari passu* of Jewish Christianity side

¹ ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, October, 1917, pp. 439 ff.

² "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde," By Ferdinand Christian Bauer, in *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1831.

³ "Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefs," F. C. Bauer, in *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie*, 1836.

⁴ *Die sogenannten Pastoralbriefe*, by F. C. Bauer, 1835.

⁵ *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi* (1st ed., 1845; 2d ed., 1866; English translation, by "A. P." and A. Menzies, 1874-1875).

⁶ *Das nachapostolische Zeitalter in den Hauptmomenten seiner Entwicklung*, by Albert Schwegler, 1846.

⁷ *Die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, 1st ed., 1850.

by side with Gentile. There was no evolution of such sort. The difficulties in regard to discipline, arising between Judaiser and St. Paul were authoritatively settled by the Apostolic body of teachers. Bauer is hopelessly unscientific in his failure to account for the points of agreement between *his* two parties, and for the ease with which all disciplinary differences were shortly made up.

2. *Weakness of Ritschl against Bauer.* The weak point in Ritschl's argument against Bauer is that he fails to give full historical worth to the New Testament documents; and, as a matter of course, does not show the strongest of the evidence of accord between Peter and Paul in their respective Gospels. As Schweitzer says:

The only solid fact which Ritschl is able to adduce is the expectation of the Parousia. He assumes that it formed a very important part of the common doctrinal material, and inclines to believe that Paulinism and Christianity agree in an *ideal-real* expectation of the Second Coming in order to make common cause against Chiliasm, though the latter in its coarser form appeared only later.⁸

We have shown how Schweitzer arbitrarily assumes eschatology as the only hinge upon which to swing the whole gigantic bulk of his blasphemous Christology.⁹ As to Ritschl's "*ideal-real* expectation of the Second Coming", it is merely a prelude to the winsome melody that he later played upon one string—the *Werturtheilen*, the value-judgments in Christology. The expectation of the parousia had a value to the conscience of the early Christian community; it was an *idealized reality*, if not a *realized ideality*—and that was quite enough for the times. How ridiculous!

Since Ritschl is so weak in refuting Bauer, we shall present a few facts of early Church history to show how slight were the differences between the Petrine and Pauline disciplinary economy, and how easily the two Apostles came to one view in regard to the somewhat moot question of the Apostolic Church of Jerusalem—the admission of Gentile converts into the Church upon equal footing with Judæo-Christians.

⁸ Cf. *Paul and his Interpreters. A Critical History.* By Albert Schweitzer. Eng. trans by W. Montgomery. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1912), p. 18.

⁹ Cf. "The Eschatological Christ," ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, June, 1915, pp. 736 ff.

II. **A Few Facts Against Bauer.** By a brief review of the relations of St. Paul to St. Peter, from the beginning of the Pauline ministry until the end of the great Gentile Apostle's third mission journey, A. D. 37-59, we shall see that no doctrinal antagonism ever divided the two mighty leaders. There were no Petrine and Pauline parties, approved of by either Apostle. Such parties existed unauthoritatively at Corinth, and, likely enough, elsewhere. What was the attitude of Peter to this partisanship? It was undoubtedly that of Paul. When Paul heard of the Corinthian partisan shibboleths, "I am of Paul! I am of Apollos! I am of Kephass!", he straightway made reply: "I am of Christ! Is Christ divided? Paul was not crucified for you, was he? Or, were ye baptized in the name of Paul?"¹⁰ Like to this would have been the reply of Peter. Facts bear witness to our contention.

1. *The First Journey of Paul to Jerusalem.* Three years after his conversion, A. D. 37, St. Paul made a first visit to the Church at Jerusalem. He abode with St. Peter, the head of the Apostolic Church, fifteen days; and saw no other Apostle, except James.¹¹ Indeed, the Apostles, who did not begin their dispersion from Jerusalem until about A. D. 43, were at first suspicious of Paul, and of set purpose kept aloof from him.¹² It was Barnabas of Cyprus, a convert of the first year of the Church in Jerusalem,¹³ who won Peter over to the side of Paul and brought the two great Apostles together.¹⁴ Peter then and there approved of Paul's mission to the Gentiles. This authoritative approval by Peter we may conclude from the fact that Paul with his wonted ardor straightway applied himself to the work, which had been assigned him by Jesus,¹⁵ and that in the very heart of the Apostolic Church, "going in and out, speaking fearlessly in the name of the Lord; and he frequently talked and debated with the Hellenists"¹⁶—that is, with the Gentile folk of Jerusalem.

The same year, A. D. 37, St. Peter, who, some eight years before, had already preached the Gospel to Jew and Gentile alike,¹⁷ was enlightened by a vision at Jaffa in the matter of

¹⁰ 1 Corinthians 1:12-13.

¹² Acts 9:26.

¹⁴ Acts 9:27.

¹⁶ Acts 9:28-29.

¹¹ Galatians 1:18.

¹³ Acts 4:36-37.

¹⁵ Acts 9:15.

¹⁷ Acts 2:14.

equal rights to both sets of converts.¹⁸ The rest of the Apostles took it ill that, by the ministry of their head, "the Gentiles received the Word of God". The Judaisers "began to attack him, saying: 'Thou hast visited folk who were not circumcised, and hast eaten with them.'"¹⁹ Peter forthwith told the story of his vision. The result was no split into two parties, but an immediate agreement with Peter: "When they had heard this statement, they objected no more; but gave glory to God, saying: 'So even to the Gentiles God hath granted the repentance which leadeth unto life!'"²⁰

2. *The Second Journey of Paul to Jerusalem.* Nine years later, A. D. 46, St. Paul began his first great mission-journey to the Gentiles;²¹ and in the year A. D. 51, just fourteen years after his first visit to the Mother Church,²² he a second time submitted his teaching to the supreme see of Jerusalem, somewhat as bishops of to-day make their *ad limina* visits to Rome. This time, St. Paul tells us, he "went up in obedience to a revelation. I laid before them the Gospel that I preach among the Gentiles. I did this privately before those that were rated highly, lest perchance I might be running, or might have run without purpose."²³

Could a leader be more amicable? St. Paul, who had received so many and wondrous revelations in regard to his mission to the Gentiles, submitted his Gospel "*privately* before those that were rated highly"—i. e. before Peter and the few remaining Apostles. Had this exposition of his gospel been public, it would not have been such complete submission to authority as it was. Yet, why this submission? Paul knew quite well that his goal was Christ Jesus. He was conscious that he ran the race of the faith exactly as he later told this very Church of Palestine to run it:

Therefore, let us also—since we have so great a host of witnesses hovering all round about us—let us cast off every weight, and sin that girds us snugly round about; let us run with grit the race that is ahead of us, looking on Jesus, the Leader from start to finish of

¹⁸ Acts 10:10-48. Cf. "Dr. Toy's Degradation of Christianity," ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, February, 1917, pp. 208-209.

¹⁹ Acts 11:1-3.

²¹ Acts 13:1.

²³ Galatians 2:1-2.

²⁰ Acts 11:18.

²² Galatians 2:1.

the race of the faith, who put down all thought of shame, and made ever onward, not for the joy that lay within his reach, but for the cross, and now sitteth on the right hand of the throne of the Father. Yea, think ye well on him, as he made ever onward for that so great disgrace, because of the very sins committed against him, lest ye yourselves grow weary in spirit and give up.²⁴

Yet, despite the consciousness of his revelations, St. Paul submitted his teachings to authority, lest he "might be running, or might have run without purpose"!

Had St. Paul intended a doctrinal antagonism against a *Petrine party* of the early Church of Jerusalem, he would have fearlessly, persuasively, and publicly preached his revealed gospel quite independently of St. Peter; nor would he have sought private and authoritative approval of that gospel by "those that were rated highly" in the Mother Church. Jesus, who had revealed to Paul "the gospel of uncircumcision",²⁵ also revealed the obligation to submit that gospel to the supreme and infallible authority of the Church. And because of this revealed unity of jurisdiction and of doctrine, the great Apostle of the Gentiles fears to trust to his own revelations, "lest perchance *he* might be running, or might have run (the race of the faith) without purpose".

3. *The Council of Jerusalem.* The result of Paul's submission to the authority of Peter, was a triumph of the cause of Gentile converts. The Apostolic decree of the Council of Jerusalem, A. D. 51, authoritatively decided that they were on an equal footing with Judæo-Christians. The meaning of the temporary enactments of this decree, which provided a *modus vivendi* during the gradual severing of the discipline of the Church from that of the synagogue, we have already studied.²⁶

4. *A Single Difference between Peter and Paul.* Later on in that very year, A. D. 51, after Peter had transferred his see to Antioch, and while Paul was making a short sojourn there before his second mission journey,²⁷ occurred the only recorded difference between the two Apostles; this disagreement had to do with the vacillation of Peter in carrying out the Apostolic decree:

²⁴ Hebrews 12:1-3.

²⁵ Galatians 2:7.

²⁶ "The Apostolic Decree," ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, January, 1914, pp. 87 ff.

²⁷ Acts 15:33 and 36.

And when Kephas came to Antioch I opposed him to his face, (saying) that he was self-condemned. For before the coming of certain persons from James, he had been wont to eat with the Gentile converts; but, when they came, he began to withdraw and to hold himself aloof, for fear of those of the circumcision. And the rest of the Jewish converts dissembled with him, so that even Barnabas was led away by their dissimulation. But when I saw that they were not straightforward in regard to the truth of the Gospel, I said to Kephas, before them all: "If thou, who art a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles and not of Jews, why dost thou compel the Gentiles to live after the manner of Jews?"²⁸

It is futile to argue that Kephas here is not Peter. During the first six centuries, only St. Clement of Alexandria (A. D. 190-210) distinguishes the two.²⁹ Against his opinion stands the witness of St. Clement of Rome (A. D. 93),³⁰ St. Irenaeus (A. D. 181-189),³¹ Origen (A. D. 185-253),³² Tertullian (A. D. 194-221),³³ and a host of later Fathers.³⁴

The new *modus vivendi* of the Apostolic decree had been quite successful at Antioch. Living "after the manner of Gentiles", Peter had cut loose from the food laws of the synagogue, and "had been wont to eat with the Gentile converts". Then came "certain persons from James", Judaisers from the Church of Jerusalem, "those of the circumcision". From fear of these trouble-makers, Peter changed his mode of action. He simulated. His aloofness from the Gentile Christians did not accord with his doctrine. He acted in a way that "was not straightforward in regard to the truth of the Gospel". It was *this mode of action* that Paul opposed. The question was one, not of sin, but of prudence. Peter was not guilty of hypocrisy. Rendall³⁵ errs in calling "such insincerity by its true name *hypocrisy*".

²⁸ Galatians 2:11-14.

²⁹ Cf. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, I, 12.

³⁰ 1 Cor. 47.

³¹ *Contra Haereses*, III, 12, 15.

³² *Contra Celsum*, II, 1; *Stromata* X.

³³ *Contra Marcionem*, V, 3.

³⁴ Cf. "Über die Person des Cephas," Christian Pesch, in *Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie*, 1883, pp. 465-490.

³⁵ *Expositor's Greek Testament*, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1912) *in locum*.

There was no *hypocrisy* in such simulation. Peter judged that the time was not yet ripe in Antioch for complete freedom from the synagogal food laws. In exactly the same manner, eight years later, A. D. 59, just before his imprisonment at Jerusalem, Paul himself "was not straightforward in regard to the truth of the Gospel", and simulated by taking the vow of the Nazarites. James was a stickler for the Mosaic ceremonial; ³⁶ so he and the brethren of Jerusalem said to Paul:

Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of believers there are among the Jews, and all are zealots of the Law. Now they have heard of thee, and thou teachest all Jews among the Gentiles to forsake Moses saying that they should not circumcise their children nor observe our customs. What then? Without doubt they will hear that thou art come. Hence do thou as we suggest to thee. We have four men who have put themselves under vow. Join these men, be purified with them, and bear their expense so that they may shave their heads. In this wise all will know that there is no truth in what they have heard of thee, but that thou observest the Law.³⁷

St. Paul had been true as true could be to the Law.³⁸ It was most prudent on his part, in a Church that had not yet divorced itself fully from the Mosaic traditions, to observe the ceremonial of the Nazarite.³⁹ Such observance was simulation, but prudent simulation. In the Gentile Church of Antioch, however, St. Paul judged that simulation of synagogal traditions was not prudent. He took St. Peter to task merely on this score of prudence.

Yes, but was not this taking of St. Peter to task an action inconsistent with the supreme authority that the chief Apostle had? No; the history of the Church is evidence to many such instances of differences between the Popes and their subjects on the question of the prudence of a discipline.

Take the Quartodeciman controversy, a classical instance of difference of opinion between Popes and subjects. St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, together with St. Irenaeus, went to Rome, in A. D. 150, to urge upon St. Anicetus, the Pope, the imprudence of forcing the eastern bishops to celebrate the

³⁶ Cf. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, II, 23.

³⁷ Acts 21: 20-24.

³⁸ Galatians 1: 14.

³⁹ In Hebrew, *Nazir*. Cf. Numbers 6: 1-21, especially the last verse.

Christian Pasch on the Sunday following the Jewish. They claimed that their custom of celebrating Easter on the same day as the Jewish Passover, the fourteenth day of the first moon after the vernal equinoxes, was a tradition received from St. John the Apostle. The Pope yielded to their argument, just as Peter had yielded to the argument of Paul. And now the journey of Polycarp and Irenaeus to Rome is one of the best testimonies we have of the acceptance of Papal supreme jurisdiction by the early Church. In like manner, the trouble St. Paul took to oppose what he deemed *an imprudent mode of action* on the part of St. Peter shows no disrespect of the supreme authority of the head Apostle; but a respect for that authority, as an authority so supreme that it had to be either won over or followed.⁴⁰

This review of the history of the relations between Saints Peter and Paul, during the crucial period of transition from synagogal to Christian discipline, shows absolutely no trace of a doctrinal antagonism that divided the early Church into a Petrine and a Pauline party. Moreover, it brings home to us the truth that the disciplinary differences between the two leaders were very slight, and by no means so uniform as to warrant Bauer's gratuitous assumption of a Pauline revolt from Petrine Christianity.

III. Ritschl's Pacifist Christology. Ritschl realized how weak was his defence of Christianity from the vantage ground of history. He shifted ground, and changed tactics. The "Christ of history" was replaced by the "Christ of psychology". The tactics of the historian yielded to those of Kant. Thereafter, as Johann Weiss says,⁴¹ "the real roots of Ritschl's ideas are to be found in Kant and the illuminist theology".

Johann Weiss, Professor of the University of Marburg, was at first a Ritschlian. As Ritschl cut loose from Bauer and history, so Johann Weiss broke with Ritschl and psychology, and gave form to the formless eschatological theory of Reimarus. The "Eschatological Christ" of Weiss we have already ex-

⁴⁰ For an excellent defence of both Peter and Paul from the charge of sin, cf. Cornely, *Epistola ad Galatas, Cursus Scripturae Sacrae* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1892) in loc., pp. 450 ff.

⁴¹ *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, 2d ed., (Göttingen, 1900), in preface.

amined.⁴² His "Christ of history" is a mere scare-crow, forbidding, uncanny, repellent, hideous, and repulsive to the scientific historian of the early Church. Ritschl's Pacifist Christ is not so frightful, but equally unscientific.

Once Ritschl had his theory of value-judgments fully at work, his Christology took in anything that the Kantian *Ought* dictated as categorically imperative to the community conscience. As Schweitzer, in his first edition of *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, scathingly writes, these value-judgments led Ritschl with *naïveté* "to attribute modern ideas to Jesus, and then by way of 'New Testament Theology' to take them back from Him as a loan".⁴³

This "New Testament Theology" of Ritschl is not taken very seriously by the eschatologist Schweitzer. He tells us, it "sends to earth peace instead of a sword"⁴⁴—peace at any price, even at the price of the prostitution of reason! It appeals to men as a *Vermittlungstheologie*—a mediating, time-serving, weather-vane theology, which steers clear of the Scylla of Bauer and the Charybdis of Hegel. The so-called intellectualism of Hegel had been disastrous to Lutheranism; hence, about the middle of the nineteenth century, Protestant theology divorced intellectualism; and found it advisable not to come into contact with, much less to rub up against, philosophy.⁴⁵ It was Ritschl who put method into these divorce proceedings.⁴⁶ He took himself most seriously; accepted the self-conferred commission of captain; and, as commander of a *camouflage* Bark of Peter, he went out of the way of all difficulties, and sailed the way the wind blew, the way of values to the feelings. He handled the helm, so as to stand well off from the rocks of reason; and hugged the shore of emotionalism, so as to bend an eager ear to the siren-song of love and peace. This weather-cock, peace-at-any-price, mediating Christology is thus ex-coriated by Schweitzer:

⁴² Cf. "The Eschatological Christ," *ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW*, June, 1915, pp. 738 ff.

⁴³ Cf. *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, English translation, of W. Montgomery, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede, 2d Eng. ed. (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1911), p. 250.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* p. 320.

⁴⁵ Cf. *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. By Albert Schweitzer. 2d ed. of *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*. (Tübingen: Mohr. 1913) p. 508.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.* p. 504.

Ritschl and his followers dug the grave for all vigor and freedom of thought in matters of religion. They hindered all attempts at agreement and coördination. With a haughty gesture, they put aside the name of "liberal"; fought shy of party-spirit and open discussion; outdid each other in "methods" and fine airs, so as by pretty words to clear the way of all freedom of speech and harmony of ideas. They so caught up the present generation of "moderns" that these latter, instead of setting full sail upon the sea of knowledge, have been satisfied with the gentle breeze of the spirit and lulled by the Aeolian harp of a pacifist theology.⁴⁷

For an instance of "fine airs", "pretty words", the modern Protestant "gentle breeze of the spirit", and the lull of "the Aeolian harp of a pacifist theology", we refer the reader to our study of the Christology of the late Principal Fairbairn.⁴⁸

IV. Faith According to Ritschl. To understand the course of Ritschl at the helm, we must bear it ever in mind that his chosen channel is entirely of the emotions, or, at most, the will. The dictate of pure reason is suspected as a shallow, a shoal, a coral reef. The dictate of practical reason, the *sensing* of an emotional value, is the buoy or lighthouse to follow. Ritschl chooses his channel quite in keeping with the idea of faith he got from the Reformers.

Justification by faith, according to Ritschl, is a change from the feeling of mistrust toward God, bound up in a consciousness of guilt, to the feeling of trust, bound up in Godwardness of the will. This *new direction of the will is faith*; and faith is not an act of the reason, but the *will's obedience* to God:

Justification effects a change in the consciousness of guilt in this respect, that the *feeling of mistrust* toward God which is bound up with that consciousness, and the shrinking from Him which results therefrom, are replaced by a consenting movement of the will toward God. This new direction of the will to God, which is evoked by reconciliation, is, in the Evangelical view, faith; and, in so far as it expects to be determined solely by God, it belongs as a special class to the general idea of *obedience*.⁴⁹

⁴⁷ Ibid. p. 513.

⁴⁸ "Another Congregational Christology." ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, April, 1915, pp. 488 ff.

⁴⁹ Cf. *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, by Albrecht Ritschl. Eng. trans., *The Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation*, tr. by H. R. Mackintosh and A. B. Macaulay, 2d ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902), p. 100.

The "new direction of the will toward God", the act of justifying faith, is certainly not an act of the reason: "Faith means neither the acknowledgment of the correctness of traditional facts, nor the acceptance of orthodox propositions, but trust in God's grace."⁵⁰ "Trust in God's grace" seems at times to be an act of the will, and again nothing more than an *emotional* uplift:

Faith is *emotional* conviction of the harmony between the Divine purposes and the most intimate interests of man. . . . This is an interest which expresses itself in *emotion*—that is, interest not in the discovery of truth for itself. but in the feeling of moral pleasure and in the satisfaction of our spirit.⁵¹

It may be that Ritschl inherited this obscurity in regard to the act of faith, from Luther, Melanchthon, and Calvin. Luther we shall take up later on. Melanchthon *seems* to define faith as an act of the will:

Fides quae justificat . . . est velle accipere promissionem remissionis peccatorum et justificationis.⁵²

Fides . . . est fiducia misericordiae Dei promissae propter mediatorem Christum. Nam fiducia est motus in voluntate . . . quo voluntas in Christo quiescit.⁵³

Calvin gives to faith an *emotional* character:

Assensionem ipsam, iterum repetam, *cordis* esse magis quam cerebri, et *affectus* magis quam intelligentiae . . . *Sensus plerophoriae*, quae fidei tribuitur, est nempe qui Dei bonitatem, perspicue nobis propositam, extra dubium ponat. Id autem fieri nequit, quin ejus suavitatem vere *sentiamus et experiamur* in nobis ipsis.⁵⁴

The "sense of plerophory", a sense of assurance that Christ is of value to the conscience, seems to be the sum and all of what Ritschl means by an act of faith. And such a sense of assurance is rather emotional than volitional; for it does not depend upon reason's dictate to the will, but upon a vague feeling that somehow or other all goes well.

WALTER DRUM, S.J.

Woodstock, Maryland.

⁵⁰ Ibid. p. 101.

⁵¹ Ibid. p. 101.

⁵² *Apologia*, ii, 48.

⁵³ *Loci Theologici*, xxi, p. 744.

⁵⁴ *Institutiones Christianae Religionis*, iii, 8 and 15.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE NATURE AND HISTORY OF THE BIBLE. By the Right Rev. William Aloysius Fletcher, D.D., Rector of the Cathedral, Baltimore. J. H. Furst Company, 1917. Pp. 175.

Dr. Fletcher has enriched our popular English literature on the Bible by this well written, well edited, and comprehensive demonstration of the value, historically, that attaches to the Catholic version of the inspired Scriptures. The book is apologetic and expository, not polemic. The author defines his terms with care and precision. Distinguishing between divine and human authorship, he vindicates the Catholic position by reference to documentary evidence and rational interpretation. Thus the student is made familiar with the basis on which Catholics justly rest their confidence in the Vulgate. He learns what belongs to the essential content of written revelation, and the manner in which its reading is to be approached. Whilst these subjects are discussed in the text books of General Introduction to the Bible, they are here not merely outlined but also illustrated by reference to historical and critical evidence drawn from modern as well as traditional testimony. The volume shows careful scholarship, without any unnecessary apparatus of erudition. A good Index and marginal titles throughout the book facilitate reference to the topics that are discussed.

THE SCIENCE OF ETHICS. By the Rev. Michael Cronin, M.A., D.D., Professor of Ethics and Politics, University College, Dublin, National University of Ireland. Vol. II: Special Ethics. Benziger Bros., New York. 1917. Pp. xii—691.

In taking up this the concluding portion of Dr. Cronin's *The Science of Ethics*, we are forcibly reminded of the growing indebtedness of Catholic students of philosophy to Irish teachers. The beginning (Logic) and the ending (Ethics) department of the Catholic system of philosophy, are now filled by the unsurpassed productions of two Irish professors. We allude of course to *The Science of Logic* (2 vols. Longmans) by Dr. Coffey and to the present *Science of Ethics* by Dr. Cronin. Neither of these veritable treatises has any peer in English. Dr. Coffey, moreover, has given us our most notable work — if we may except the unfinished *Metaphysics of the School* by Father Harper, S. J.—on *Ontology*. To him likewise we owe *The History of Medieval Philosophy*, a translation of the well known Louvain Professor de Wulff's French work on that subject,

as also the *Introduction to Scholasticism, Old and New*, a translation likewise of De Wulff's volume. Both of these latter volumes are practically unique in our philosophical literature. Again, the only books treating the Human Will from a Catholic and an experimental point of view come to us from the pen of an Irish Jesuit, Father Barrett, while one of the simplest and clearest Latin text books we possess—*Summula Philosophiae Scholasticae* (3 vols. Brown & Nolan, Dublin) — has been written by an Irish Cistercian, Father Hickey. All these contributions—and the number might easily be enlarged—to our philosophy are, it may be unnecessary to add, of to-day and yesterday. With this mention of them, we may now proceed to examine the most recent accession to the list—the volume before us.

Doubtless many who made the acquaintance some eight years ago of its predecessor have been looking eagerly for this—may we not call it?—the better half of the work. When they come, however, to estimate how much of toil, of thought and research the present volume must have demanded, the reason for its tardy arrival will be manifest.

The subjects here treated are the traditional stock-in-trade of special as distinguished from general Ethics; that is, in the first place, the duties which man, the individual, owes to God, to himself, and to his fellows, and, in the second place, man's duties in society, domestic and civil. There is of course not much room for originality so far as the substance of doctrine on these lines is concerned. An author merits well if he expound accurately and establish rationally and solidly the *verbum sanum et irreprehensibile*. It goes without saying too that the present author has succeeded admirably in all this. Incidentally he demonstrates that the English language lends itself plastically to the moulds of Scholastic Ethics, provided the artist be a master of both matter and form, whatever be the stubbornness of our tongue in yielding itself to Metaphysics.

But the old truths need fresh application to the new problems that grow out of the complexities of modern life, and they readily expand themselves to take in the new materials that are brought to it by advancing science and research. Instances of this widening process appear in the very first chapter of the present volume, which treats of man's duties to God. Since man is obliged to know, love, serve and worship God, the question arises how man comes to know God, and whether the humble, uneducated mind has access to such knowledge. Dr. Cronin shows conclusively that sources of such knowledge are easily available even to the rudest of men. But if religion is an essential and fundamental obligation, has it always prevailed in the race? Sir John Lubbock, and rationalists and thor-

oughgoing evolutionists generally, maintain with no small show of erudition a pre-religious period in man's development, a time when men knew naught of God or of a future life. The theory is, it is true, losing ground of late, as anthropologists are getting better informed about the religious beliefs and customs of the so-called "primitive races". The facts in the case are summarized in the book before us. The religious ideas of low types such as the native Australians, and the African Pygmies and Bantus, the Andaman Islanders and the Maoris are critically examined, and the conclusion is reached that no race or tribe has yet been found devoid of all religious and spiritual ideas.

The various theories devised to give an evolutionary origin to religion, namely nature-worship, magic, animism, fetishism, and other creations of the savage imagination are also discussed. The treatment of the whole subject reflects a consciousness of what minds alien to our own have been thinking upon these fundamental beliefs and duties, and tallies quite with that point of view which prompted Father Martindale and his associates to compile that unique collection, *The History of Religions*.¹

We could wish in this connexion that Dr. Cronin had explicitly manifested his dissent from that almost universal position of evolutionism which maintains that the existing savage races are the true representatives of primitive man. There is, of course, no real justification of such opinion. On the contrary the whole weight of sound argument is against the savage, and *a fortiori* the bestial, descent of man. The wonderful expressiveness of savage languages alone points to a lapse from a higher to a lower stage. Even Darwin was amazed at the flexibility of the Tierra-del-Fuegan speech, which might well, as, in his confession, did the peacock's tail, have made him "feel sick".

Coming next to man's duties toward himself, we find the illicitness of suicide established on the three grounds that direct self-murder is opposed (1) to the suicide's own nature; (2) it is an injustice to society; (3) it is an insult to God. All these reasons are doubtless probable and persuasive, but they are hardly demonstrative, apart from the one argument which is unfortunately omitted, namely, that suicide is an injustice against the Creator, the author and consequently the owner and disposer of human life.

The fourth chapter deals with private ownership and introduces the treatment of Socialism. The nature, varieties, and origin of private property are adequately expounded and solidly established, but the *pièce de resistance* is Socialism. Socialism is discussed as a

¹ 5 vols., Catholic Truth Society, London.

movement, having its philosophical foundations derived chiefly through Marx from Hegel and Darwin, but it is mainly as an economic theory that it is here regarded. The philosophical grounds are duly examined. Probably some students would have welcomed a fuller treatment of the economic, not to say materialistic, interpretation of history. Most of our writers pass too lightly over this ground of Marxian Socialism. It is true no doubt, as Dr. Cronin observes, that "even if we did believe with Marx that economic needs were the most fundamental factor in the development of human institutions, the question would still remain whether Socialism is lawful and whether it is a good and useful economic system or the opposite" (p. 162). Nevertheless, being one of the leading claims of Socialist philosophy, it ought to be thoroughly dissected, the more so that it possesses a considerable amount of truth and has certainly a plausible aspect. What, more than economic causes, is back of the present world crisis? What brought on our American Revolution, and even our Civil War? And so on. To be sure, there were other causes. Nor do Socialists say that there were not, only they envisage the economic more vividly. Anyhow the truth and the falsity should be sifted out, and if the space devoted in the present volume to discussing the law of the concentration of capital had been shared with the foregoing argument, the canons of parsimony would probably have been justly respected.

It is, however, of secondary importance, or, at least, effect, to discuss with Socialists their philosophical groundwork. Their strong point is economics and particularly the insistence that wages will be ever so much higher under the new regime. Your pay envelope will bulge large in the good time that is coming; and, what is better still, you will get more for working less. This claim Dr. Cronin examines most thoroughly, and proves arithmetically how, under the economic methods proposed by Socialists, the national income cannot possibly furnish an average wage equal to the present earnings of labor.

In fine, there is no serious aspect or proposal of Socialism that does not receive just consideration, and it might be well, as someone has suggested, if the five chapters covering the subject were published as a separate monograph.

The next subject of special interest is that of contracts. Here the vexing problems of the just price in selling and buying, and of the just wage in the labor contract, come to the front. Dr. Cronin finds no difficulty in accepting the solution given by St. Thomas, according to which the seller must not exact a special charge for the peculiar pleasure which an article affords to the buyer, or the special value it possesses in itself or for other people (p. 319). This looks to be equitable. Still, we find the wily white handing over to the guileless primitive a few strings of glass beads as a price for ivory tusks,

precious pelfs and other such articles prized by civilized man. The savage likes the glittering glass, the cultured citizen the shiny ivory. Nor is the latter's conscience troubled by the transaction, for he has a probable opinion in his favor, the authority of grave moralists. Thus do doctors differ while the patient wonders. "Wisdom and sight are slow in poor humanity."

The wage contract is treated with a steady hand—the family wage, discriminately interpreted, being insisted upon as binding the employer in *justice*. Strikes are likewise dealt with equitably and the conditions for their lawfulness carefully laid down. The "general strike" receives, of course, no shadow of concession.

About half the volume is devoted to Social Ethics. So many problems grow out of domestic society that Dr. Cronin has wisely eliminated the elementary matters regarding parental and filial obligations in favor of a more thorough discussion of the philosophical and historical questions concerning the family. The State—its nature, origin, and forms; sovereignty—its functions; on these vital topics Dr. Cronin throws, as is his wont, the light of history and experience, as well as of philosophy. Next to the treatment of Socialism mentioned above, this, the concluding third of the volume, will be found, we think, of prime interest and importance.

In the chapter on international law, such actual questions as air raids and sinking of merchant ships, reprisals, and so on, about which many people are, in more than one sense, just now troubled, loom up. Air raids upon fortifications, arsenals, military barracks, munition factories, and other belligerent institutions and places, are declared to be "lawful, provided every care is taken to spare the lives and property of non-combatants. But *indiscriminate* air raids upon cities like London, Manchester, Cologne, or Berlin, are quite unlawful".

These are delicate matters, however, and the reviewer has no desire to invite controversy. He would simply indicate the author's decision, and suggest the possibility of another. For the rest, Dr. Cronin has given us, as was said above, the most comprehensive, solid, and thorough exposition of Moral Philosophy at present existing in the English language. The work will prove invaluable both for professors and advanced students. If not every one of its statements will receive universal acceptance, there is none for which strong and persuasive grounds are not brought forward, while the essential contents of Ethics are luminously set forth and firmly established. What we should like to have from the same expert hand is a distinct treatise on Sociology. Catholic Sociology still awaits its builder.

CANON SHEEHAN OF DONERAILE. The Story of an Irish Parish Priest as told chiefly by Himself in Books, Personal Memoirs and Letters. By the Rev. Herman J. Heuser, D.D. With Portraits and other Illustrations. Longmans, Green & Co., New York. 1917.

It is eminently fitting, and no less fortunate, that the story of Canon Sheehan's life should be told to the world by the author of the present volume. It was Dr. Heuser who first discovered and revealed through the pages of this REVIEW the literary genius hidden away in the semi-obscure village of Doneraile. The account of that discovery is narrated in detail in the biography at hand, and so need not detain us here. Just enough may be mentioned to confirm, even though unnecessarily, the initial statement above as to the notable fittingness of the authorship. *Geoffrey Austin*, Canon Sheehan's first book, appeared anonymously in 1894. Under the guise of a story it conveyed some criticism—pointed yet withal gentle, as became the spirit of Sheehan—of educational ideals and methods traditional in certain schools in Ireland. The reviewers at home, apparently opining that what was good enough for the forefathers was good enough for the children, gave the book no warm welcome. In England it received no notice. In America it aroused but a passing interest. The Germans alone seemed to recognize its merits, and quickly turned it into the language of the fatherland. When the book came under the notice of the editor of this REVIEW, his discerning eye at once detected the writer's power. Having taken steps to discover the author's identity, Dr. Heuser opened a correspondence with Father Sheehan, the outcome of which was *My New Curate*. Probably no Catholic work of fiction ever leaped so rapidly into fame as did the story of Daddy Dan. Edition followed edition in English, and the book was successively translated into German, French, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, Slavonic, Hungarian, and Ruthenian. The phenomenal success of *My New Curate* reacted upon *Geoffrey Austin*, which soon appeared under the author's name and was followed quickly by *The Triumph of Failure*, its sequel, and the complement of Father Sheehan's philosophy of education.

In the wake of the trio so far mentioned, volume upon volume flowed from the pen of the prolific writer, well-nigh a score in less than as many years. That the stream got beyond the uplands was due to the discovery of its fountain-head and to the opening-out of its channel by the writer of the present biography.

Moreover, the authorship is fortunate alike for the subject and the reader. For in the first place no one else was or is so fully in possession of the materials and the sources of such a biography. The long and intimate correspondence of Father Sheehan with the

founder of the *ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW*; the letters exchanged between the former and his other bosom friends, particularly the genial editor of the *Irish Monthly*, Father Matthew Russell, S.J.; the companion of Sheehan's boyhood, Mr. William O'Brien, the eminent Irish Parliamentarian; and another close friend of his riper years, Mr. Oliver Wendell Holmes, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States; the testimony of Canon Sheehan's brother; and of the Religious teachers of the Doneraile Schools; a considerable amount of unpublished manuscript of a miscellaneous character—all this mass of documentary material has been so skilfully woven into the biography that in great part the subject paints his own portrait and tells his own story, the story not simply of his outward deeds but of his inmost thoughts, feelings, aspirations, motives.

The story naturally divides itself into four parts. In the first part we are introduced to Patrick Sheehan, the boy, the youth, the college student, the seminarian at Maynooth, the young priest in England and later in Ireland at Mallow and Queenstown (1851-84). It is a period of culturing and seed-sowing, and we watch the plastic character of young Sheehan enriching and unfolding in response to the influence of religious surroundings at home, in school, in church; and under the touch of Nature's charms. Endowed with keen and alert powers of observation, nothing that was fair and beautiful escaped him. A lover of the glens and the brooks, the hills and the fields, the birds and the sky—all these visible things of creation spoke to his soul of the invisible things of God, while they impressed his imagination and feeling with that keen appreciation of nature's loveliness which afterward lent to his writings such an atmosphere of beauteous coloring.

Step by step we follow the development of his mind and heart. The patriotic stirring of the Fenian insurrection in '67 produced an indelible impression which, tempered by the broader experiences of life and matured reflection, manifested itself in his political addresses and essays. His career at Maynooth is particularly interesting as showing his care to accompany scholastic studies with the cultivation of literature and well-chosen miscellaneous reading in order to develop that power of expression which is the indispensable requisite for the conveyance of Catholic philosophy and theology to the modern mind. More interesting still is the narrative of his career in England—Plymouth and Exeter—where he learned and unlearned many things, and accumulated experiences which afterward reproduced themselves in his books, notably in *Luke Delmege*.

In the second part, which claims the greater share of the volume, we find ourselves at home with the pastor of Doneraile. Some of his principal books are delightfully analyzed, the originals of the

more noted characters being indicated. Father Sheehan, as is well known, was severely taken to task by his countrymen and his fellow priests for having transferred to his novels portraits of living personages with their faults and failings no less than their more commendable qualities. The criticism, while a tribute to the life-likeness of his characters, was, as the biography shows, unjust. There was of course for the leading types a *fundamentum in re*, but the delicately sensitive instincts of the writer led him so to alter the circumstances and details, especially of place and surroundings, that suspicion as to the identity of the originals might be prevented. We are also given some insight into Canon Sheehan's literary habits and methods. Many will probably here learn for the first time that the author of such charming specimens of workmanship as *Under the Cedars and the Stars*, *Parerga*, to say nothing of *My New Curate*, *The Triumph of Failure*, and *Luke Delmege*, and the other creations of literary art, was never wont to revise or correct his manuscript: that he wrote *currente calamo*, his pen following so unerringly the leading of his swift thought and vivid imagery that he needed to make no erasures or insertions. The "copy" came to the printer beautifully written, unmarred by blot or blemish.

Considering the productivity of Father Sheehan's pen one would suppose that his life was wholly devoted to writing. The contrary was the case. He was first a priest, a shepherd of souls, and only in the second place a man of letters. Literature was to him simply a means, not an end. Art for art's sake had no place in his theory of esthetics. He wrote in order to convey the message of truth, of goodness, of love, of faith and loyalty to worthy ideals. It was his wont to devote methodically two hours a day to writing. The rest of his time, beyond that claimed by physical life, was devoted to his people. He understood his people. He knew his sheep and they knew him. The lambs of his flock particularly won his love and solicitude, and there are no pages more touchingly beautiful in this biography than those which tell of the reciprocal relations between Father Sheehan and the children of his parish and missions.

The social and economic interests of his people came next to their spiritual necessities in his estimation and devotedness. Thoroughly familiar with those interests and with the corresponding agrarian laws and conditions, he became in course of time a guide to his parishioners in their domestic and industrial activities; and that the peasantry of the surrounding country became more prosperous, better housed, fed and clothed, in a word, that they obtained a higher degree of reasonable comfort, was due in great measure to the superior judgment and more prudent discernment of Father Sheehan.

Nor was his interest in such matters confined to his own flock. It reached out and embraced the political welfare of the country at large. Here his far-reaching vision and his just appreciation of the moderation that must control all political agitation that can hope to succeed, and especially his strong insistence on the unification and coördination of the Irish forces of propaganda for national liberty are made manifest. One will go far before finding in this connexion so clear an exposition of sound principles and sane methods as is found in one of the Canon's essays quoted *in extenso* in this biography.

The third part of the volume deals specifically with Father Sheehan's pastoral life. In it we are given fuller details of the points suggested above, together with much interesting knowledge of his educational activity, his care of his church, his relations with his fellow priests and the religious of his schools; on much of which we should like to dwell, did our limits permit.

Then comes the end—the ending of his day and the setting of the sun. No less instructive and edifying was the closing of his fruitful life than was its period of active labor. The same gentleness and patience and, above all, delicate consideration for others, which characterized him throughout, marked the closing days of his life. His geniality and humor bore up even under the stress of pain and the tediousness of long waiting for death, and both his relations with doctors and nurses as well as his letters to his bosom friends reflected that courtesy and kindness and affability which with him were no passing dispositions, but the bloom and fruitage of permanent virtue.

Reluctantly we must bring to a close this all too inadequate account of the story of Canon Sheehan's life told by one whom he regarded with highest esteem and the warmest feelings of friendship. It is giving the biography no slight praise when we say that it is worthy of its subject. And if we add that, with a change of the personal pronoun, the work might stand as an autobiography, we shall have paid a less than just tribute to the perfection of form and dignity and grace of style with which the whole is executed.

THE WORK OF ST. OPTATUS, BISHOP OF MILEVIS, AGAINST THE DONATISTS. With Appendix. Translated into English, with Notes Critical, Explanatory, Theological and Historical. By the Rev. O. B. Vassall-Phillips, B. A., O. SS. B. Pp. 476. Longmans, Green & Co., London. 1917.

Optatus looms large in the history of the Church. His importance as a witness to the unity of the Church cannot easily be overrated. In the Donatist controversy he played no mean part, and even St.

Augustine did not disdain to make use of his powerful arguments, though he deviated from some of his views. Even in our times the work of St. Optatus constitutes a storehouse of valuable apologetic material. This latter consideration seems to justify its translation into English.

This is the first English translation. All in all, it is well done and quite readable. Judging the quality of the translation one must not forget that the diction of St. Optatus is neither smooth nor elegant, and that it is not always possible for the translator who wishes to be literal and faithful to the original text, to mend these defects. The critical apparatus is very generous, and the notes are ample, adapted to the requirements of the scholar and the exigencies of the general reader. Much labor of love is embodied in these notes and they bear the earmarks of a vast and reliable erudition. The spelling of the episcopal see of St. Optatus which the author adopts, may be disputed and is rather unusual. The translation has been made from the classical edition of Ziwsa, published in the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum*, though other editions have been duly consulted.

A very practical and useful addition to the work are the hundred sayings of St. Optatus, which have been carefully selected and serve as illustrations of various points of Catholic dogma. They bear on a wide range of doctrinal subjects and will be very welcome to the student of Theology. A copious index facilitates the use of the book for polemic or didactic purposes. If Father Vassal-Phillips's excellent translation helps to extend the knowledge of St. Optatus's work, his labor has not been in vain, and the advantage to the intellectual life of the Church will be considerable.

C. B.

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA AND ITS MAKERS. The Encyclopedia Press, New York. 1917. Pp. 192.

The Encyclopedia Press has given the touch of completeness to the splendid work done by its organizers, managers, and contributors by publishing a supplementary volume in which the story of its making from beginning to end is told in detail. It is an interesting account from many viewpoints, and adds an important chapter to the history of Catholic literature and its development in the United States. The man most deserving, if comparison is allowable in such matters, for the ultimate accomplishment as well as for the conception of the gigantic project, the realization of which has proved a boon to countless thousands of readers and students, is Father John J. Wynne, S.J. Not the least of his qualifications is seen in the fact that he knew how to select and organize the men who were to do the actual

work of writing, of revising and unifying the material brought together from many sources in every quarter of the civilized world. In this present volume of nearly two hundred pages we have the brief history of every man and woman who coöperated in the production of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. The accounts give concisely the origin, training, occupation, and achievements of the writers, together with a list of the particular articles contributed by each. Besides illustrating the building-up of the *Catholic Encyclopedia*, the volume has its worth as a reference book to distinguished literary talent in the field of Catholic science and arts. The portraits of many of the leading contributors add to the interest of the book.

THE ESSENTIALS OF PHILOSOPHY.—By R. W. Sellars, Ph. D. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1917. Pp. 311.

To crowd the essentials of philosophy into three hundred pages would seem at first blush a somewhat bold undertaking; but if one rules out, as is the way with modern philosophers, such troublesome and useless entities as substance, soul, freedom, God, the venture comes within measurable reach of the attainable. As a matter of fact the author does not propose to cover the entire field of philosophy, as the title, undoubtedly, would lead one to believe; he confines himself, practically, to the study of epistemological problems. Therein he is in full agreement with the modern conception of philosophy, which makes philosophy and the theory of knowledge continuous. Incidentally, of course, the weightier questions of metaphysics are lightly disposed of; for a theory of knowledge cannot but trench on metaphysical ground and, inevitably, predetermines the solution of all ulterior philosophical questions. Thus we have in the author's little volume, if not his complete philosophy, at least its fundamental orientation and its final implications. And of these we may say that they make for what, in default of a better term, we might call a refined materialism complicated by subjective elements.

The drift of the author's speculation and at the same time his frank and lucid treatment of abstruse matters will appear from a few pertinent quotations selected with regard to the different topics touched upon. A more accurate laying out of the province of philosophy than the author gives will not readily be found. These are his words: "Philosophy has for its aim, then, not the discovery of some province which has not already been worked by the usual methods of observation, experimentation, and conjecture, but the interpretation in a critical and coördinating fashion of the principles, assumptions, and conclusions of the special sciences" (4).

Although the common sense view of the external world is repudiated as involving an untenable copy-theory of knowledge, it is not treated with the withering scorn which modern philosophers are wont to heap upon it; in fact, it is acknowledged to be the starting point of philosophy, which, however, must be speedily outgrown. Upon reflection, "Natural Realism broke down and philosophical systems took its place" (p. 29). The author thinks to escape all the difficulties that beset the problem of knowledge by giving the whole question a new twist which would make all objections pointless and irrelevant. "The correct form of the question is, then, as follows. How can we have knowledge of an extra-mental realm if the propositions which contain this knowledge exist only in consciousness? As soon as this correct form is given, it is realized that there is really no problem. Where else should knowledge exist?" (p. 117). This is naïveté with a vengeance. For, whether the truth exists in concepts or propositions, in both cases the claim to objectivity must be validated. At this point the author's non-apprehensional realism breaks down completely.

Consciousness is a form of behavior, and the mind a function of the brain. "Putting the results of introspective and objective psychology together . . . we are driven to the conclusion that mind is not a thing apart from the organism but only a selective term for those inherited capacities of the organism which are developed and filled out by its functional activities" (266).

The methodical features of the work deserve careful attention. There is a breeziness in the exposition which makes the congealed sap flow in what generally looks like dead and dry issues. The characteristic illustrations drawn from the writings of representative thinkers introduce the student to the history of philosophy and develop a taste for further studies. C. B.

Literary Chat.

The American Catholic Quarterly Review during the year has published a rather remarkable series of papers dealing with a citation from the Book of Job in the "Imitation of Christ". As the passage stands in our Vulgate it is hardly intelligible. "Aures quae venas divini susurri suscipiunt" is manifestly a mistranslation of the original, though the sense intended by the author may be gathered from the context. The study which Monsignor Hugh T. Henry, Litt. D., makes of the "venae susurri" (the veins of its whisper), "a crux of the Imitation", derives its interest for the student of letters chiefly from the extraordinary light which the writer throws upon the various interpretations of the expression. He gives not only the English translations but those of many foreign tongues, some of them not accessible to the ordinary inquirer. In the last paper of the series Dr. Henry goes over the ground of medieval commen-

tators. The three essays present a most attractive study. Incidentally it confirms what Lord Byron said of the Book of Job, namely, that it is the "most sublime poem in the world". At the same time, the study develops some new views about the author of the "Imitation", whose identity has been frequently questioned by literary critics. These papers, if published in book form, would make a valuable addition to the history of the "Imitation".

Bishop Schrembs, of the Toledo Diocese, keeps his clergy and flock alive to the spiritual and temporal needs of organized education and charity work. The *Official Year Book* for 1917, published from the Chancery Office, gives a detailed and illustrated account of the material improvements in the building of churches, schools, and pastoral adjuncts during the year. The statistics given cover the reports of the various collections for charitable purposes and in particular that for the support of the seminarians. A Pastoral Letter introduces the Report, which is moreover furnished with the customary calendars, clergy lists, appointments, and necrology—a thoroughly serviceable manual, in particular for priests and religious superiors.

Chaplains' Aid Association Bulletin, published under the direction of Father John J. Burke, C.S.P., chronicles the excellent work done by the various branches of the Association to safeguard the religious convictions of our young men in the Army and Navy. The approach of the Christmas season gives occasion for special suggestions to make our soldiers and sailors realize the joys of a Catholic fellowship (publication office, 580 Fifth Avenue, New York City).

There is a good deal of delightful Irish humor compressed into the decade of short stories under the title of *Thundher an' Turf* by the Rev. Mark O'Byrne, whose portrait adorns the front of the volume. The tales have nearly always a priest for their chief subject, inasmuch as it is he who observes, often directs, and narrates what happens in Carnemore Parish or the neighborhood. The *Priests' Boy*, *A Country Fiddler*, *St. Patrick's Night in Coolduff*, *Barefoot Seamus*, are some of the titles; they give a suggestion of the character and quality of the stories (P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York).

More war literature pours in from France. Some of it is elevating and inspiring, suggestive of a spiritual reawakening of the nation, such as *Les Françaises et la Grande Guerre* (Berthem-Bontoux) and *Pour la Croisade du XX. Siècle* (Th. Delmont). Much of it is trashy and unsubstantial, serving merely the purposes of propaganda. To this category belong *Guerre de Religions* (F. Masson), and *Le Dieu allemand* (D. Cochin). The latter, as their titles indicate, attempt to stamp the present conflict as a religious war. When one considers the alignment of the powers on either side, it seems difficult to accept this thesis. All of these come from the publishing house of Bloud & Gay, Paris.

The Monks of Westminster (Being a register of the Brethren of the Convent from the time of the Confessor to the Dissolution. With Lists of the Obedientiaries and an Introduction by E. H. Pearce, M.A., Canon and Archdeacon of Westminster.) is a document rich in pathos. It conjures up visions of a now mourning and silent convent teeming with generations of holy monks and vocal with their liturgical prayers. The Introduction pictures in a graphic way the daily life of the brethren under their prior, as the abbots themselves were mostly absent on important diplomatic missions. The list is compiled with painstaking labor and will be of great importance for the future historian. Little human touches, as they are frequently found in medieval chronicles, add color and life to the long lists of names. The dissolution falls like a black shadow across that beautiful life which had unfolded in the solitude of this venerable sanctuary. (G. P. Putnam's Son, New York: Cambridge Press, London.)

P. J. Kenedy & Sons announce the early publication of *Religious Profession*, a commentary on a chapter of the new Code of Canon Law. It is from the

pen of Father Hector Papi, S.J., Professor of Canon Law at Woodstock College. The volume is sure to prove of great value to religious communities.

Like swallows in spring, the harbingers of the new year, the annual calendars and almanacs are at this season beginning to make their appearance. Keen competition makes it necessary to arrive on the field before the rival has gleaned the harvest. But there are some which, on account of certain characteristic features, have won for themselves a loyal clientele clinging to their first choice. Among such old favorites are the *Catholic Home Annual for 1918* (published for thirty-five years by the Messrs. Benziger Brothers), the *Illustrierte Apostel-Kalender 1918* (St. Nazianz, Wisconsin), and *Der Familienfreund* (St. Louis, Missouri). They well deserve their popularity and make it a point to maintain the traditional standard. Richly and handsomely illustrated, they contain clever stories, humoristic sketches, solid instructions, and an abundance of miscellaneous and useful information.

The Manna Almanac appeals first and last to youth and deserves its subtitle, "The Young Folks' Delight". Neatly and cleverly pictured, it contains equally attractive reading matter—stories pleasant, besides thoughts that edify and instruct; it surely will win the hearts of our boys and girls. (Society of the Divine Word, Nazianz, Wisconsin.)

To popularize truth calls for a special genius not at all as common as some would think. There can be no question, however, that the Rev. Dr. Thomas F. Coakley possesses this gift in a high degree. His little pamphlet *Inside Facts about the Catholic Church* gives ample evidence of this, or rather strengthens a conviction previously formed by reading other writings coming from his fertile and facile pen. The pages of this readable pamphlet are crowded with interesting facts, and the language is as clear as a crystal. Minor inaccuracies of expression are willingly overlooked, for they do not detract from the usefulness of the booklet of three score and ten interesting pages. (Catholic Truth Society, 136 North Craig Street, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

Inexpensive colored picture books for Catholic children, with suitable religious text, are so uncommon that all teachers and parents will be gratified to know that a series of three attractive booklets containing stories about the life of our Lord is soon to be issued by P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. Each little volume is to contain eight beautifully colored pictures. *Stories from the New Testament* is the title of the series.

Chronicles of an Old Missouri Parish (Historical Sketches of St. Michael's Church, Frederickstown, Madison Co., Mo. By the Rev. J. Rothensteiner. Amerika Print, St. Louis) is a fruit of the historical spirit which is beginning to spread through the Catholic Church of America. It is meet that we should preserve the records of the deeds of our fathers. If these are not collected now, they will perish irretrievably, much to the despair of the future historian. The author has accomplished his task well; he has given us a real history, not a eulogy. For any one familiar with the difficulties besetting historical research, it is quite evident that much painstaking work has gone into the making of this book, small though it be in bulk. The plastic grouping of the facts and the charm of the diction betray the poet; for Father Rothensteiner is both an exact historian and a brilliant poet, a somewhat rare, but happy, combination.

An Archbishop's Inheritance (by T. Gavan Duffy) is a document of strong human appeal. It should be read by every Catholic in the United States. It reminds us of our duties to our brethren in pagan lands and of the splendid possibilities in missionary countries which cannot be realized for want of funds. All the personal magnetism of Father Gavan Duffy beams forth from these pages. The story grips the heart and calls to the fore all the generous instincts slumbering in the human breast. May this powerful appeal loosen many

purse-strings and bring a golden harvest to the heroic missionary laboring under such trying and discouraging circumstances! (Propagation of the Faith, 25 Granby Street, Boston.)

Our readers will be interested to know that B. Herder is preparing for early publication the second revised edition of the four volumes on the Sacraments in the Pohle-Preuss Series. The same publisher expects to issue before Christmas the first volume of an English adaptation of Koch's *Moral Theology*. This series will comprise five volumes of about the average size of the well-known Preuss-Pohle volumes.

A bright little book that will aid in drawing souls closer to the Dweller in the Tabernacle bears the title *Thursdays with the Blessed Sacrament* by the Rev. C. McNeiry, C.S.S.R. It comprises short readings for every Thursday of the year. The readings consist of edifying stories which suggest pious thoughts and feelings and likewise make good illustrative material for sermons on the Blessed Eucharist. (Benziger Brothers, New York.)

Laymen and women who, whether because of failing sight or the dim religious light of their parish church, find it difficult to use the average manual of prayers, will welcome "the extra large type edition" in which the well and favorably known *Manna of the Soul* can now be had. The devotions have been compiled by Father Lasance. The letterpress is large and clear, the paper excellent, and the binding neat and durable. It makes a suitable Christmas souvenir. (Benziger Brothers.)

The English Truth Society issues in a small pamphlet format five short lectures on *Authority and Religious Belief*, by Father Joseph Rickaby, S.J. The lectures treat briefly of various aspects, positive and negative, of faith and private judgment. Needless to say, the topics are treated in that luminous, solid, and original fashion which we have long ago come to associate with Father Joseph Rickaby's writings.

Teaching by allegory, our story commends itself no less because of its accordance with sound psychological principles than for its age-long employment by the sages. Surest of all warrants, it was the favorite method used by Him who was wont to speak to the multitudes only in parable. Life has ever been the favorite subject of allegory. Hence Father Frederick Lynk, S.V.D., in his attractive little brochure, *The Music of Life and Other Allegories*, touches familiar themes. He touches them freshly, however, and with all the tints that serve to give variety to the unity of the subject. Thus he pictures for us the house of life, the school of life, the garden of life, the tree of life, the banquet of life, and so on—a score and more of views from which he envisages life. The thoughts are apposite; so too is the imagery. Each allegory is preceded by a neat little drawing, contributing not a little to make the booklet a desirable token of Christmastide. (Society of the Divine Word, Techny, Illinois.)

If you want to test and then to nurture your patriotism by doing something worth while for the boys in khaki or in blue, circulate amongst them a little booklet entitled *Thrift*. The writer, P. G. R., knows how to get at the natural basis of character—reasonable self-control—and he makes the right use of the soldier's pay-envelope, the *materia circa quam*. It is worth far more than its weight in gold, this wee booklet, and if widely spread in the camps would help save many a youth from evil and make of him a better man and a better soldier. The pamphlet is the initial number of the Catholic Soldiers' Series which is being issued by the Catholic Central Verein, St. Louis, Missouri.

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

MANNA OF THE SOUL. A Book of Prayer for Men and Women. Compiled by the Rev. F. X. Lasance, author of *My Prayer-Book*, etc. Extra large type edition. Benziger Bros., New York. 1917. Pp. xii—528. Price, \$1.25.

THURSDAYS WITH THE BLESSED SACRAMENT. By the Rev. C. McNeiry, Redemptorist. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 213.

THE LIFE OF SAINT WINEFRIDE. By Father Philip Metcalf, S.J. Reprinted from the Edition of 1712. With an Introduction and an Appendix of Recent Cures at St. Winefride's Well, by the Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J. Catholic Truth Society, London. 1917. Pp. xxii—122. Price, 1/3 net.

THE COMPLEAT PROTESTANT. Some Dialogues. By John Ayscough. Catholic Truth Society, London. 1917. Pp. 62. Price, -/6 net.

HISTORICAL.

LONDON CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY PAMPHLETS (Price, One Penny Each): *The Latin Tradition*. By the Bishop of Clifton. Pp. 16. — *Why ROMAN Catholic?* By the Rev. E. C. Messinger, Ph.B. (Louvain). Pp. 20. — *Catholic Because Roman Catholic*. A Statement and the Reply. Pp. 20. — *Marriage and Divorce*. By J. E. Kendal, O.S.B. Pp. 20. — *The Peace of God*. By the Bishop of Northampton. Pp. 12. — *The Kulturkampf*. By Humphrey Johnson, B.A. Pp. 28. — *The Ebb and Flow of Scientific Opinion*. By Sir Bertram Windle, M.D., F.R.S., K.S.G., President of the University College, Cork. Pp. 16.

OFFICIAL YEAR BOOK AND SEMINARY REPORT of the Diocese of Toledo for the Year ending 1 October, 1917. Diocesan Chancery of Toledo, 525 Islington Street, Toledo, Ohio. 1917. Pp. 173.

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA AND ITS MAKERS. The Encyclopedia Press, Inc., New York. 1917. Pp. viii—192.

"PAGES ACTUELLES", 1914-1917: No. 16, *Le Général Galliéni*. Par G. Blanchon, Rédacteur au *Journal des Débats*. 1915. Pp. 31. No. 95, *Toute la France pour Toute la Guerre*. Par Louis Barthou, Ancien Président du Conseil. Conférence faite à Genève le 26 juillet 1916. 1916. Pp. 47. No. 100, *Les Commandements de la Patrie*. Par M. Paul Deschanel, de l'Académie française et de l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques, Président de la Chambre des Députés. 1917. Pp. 47. No. 105, *Le Capitaine Augustin Cochon*. Quelques Lettres de Guerre. Préface de Paul Bourget, de l'Académie française. 1917. Pp. 64. No. 107, *L'Effort et le Devoir Français*. Par Alexandre Millerand, Ancien Ministre de la Guerre. 1917. Pp. 39. No. 108, *Verdun!* "Les Souffrances et la Grandeur d'Ame de la Glorieuse Cité" ou "Le Martyre et la Gloire de Verdun". Par Mgr. Ch. Ginisty, Evêque de Verdun. 1917. Pp. 40. Bloud & Gay, Paris et Barcelone. Prix, 0 fr. 60 par volume.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA. By Thomas Kilby Smith, of the Philadelphia Bar. Preface by Walter George Smith, of the Philadelphia Bar. The Encyclopedia Press, Inc., New York. 1917. Pp. xi—318.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE SCIENCE OF ETHICS. By the Rev. Michael Cronin, M.A., D.D., Professor of Ethics and Politics, University College, Dublin, National University of Ireland. Vol. II: Special Ethics. Benziger Bros., New York. 1917. Pp. xii—691.

DICIONNAIRE APOLOGÉTIQUE DE LA FOI CATHOLIQUE contenant les Preuves de la Vérité de la Religion et les Réponses aux Objections tirées des Sciences humaines. Quatrième édition entièrement refondue sous la direction de A. d'Alès, Professeur à l'Institut Catholique de Paris. Avec la collaboration d'un grand nombre de Savants Catholiques. Fascicule XIII: Loi ecclésiastique—Mariolâtrie. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1917. Pp. 160.

LITURGICAL.

BREVIS COLLECTIO QUAESTIONUM RITUALIUM Quae Proponi Possunt pro Solutione a Singulis Calendaristis. Sac. D. Vincentius Tirozzi. Opella ex Ephemeridibus Liturgicis excerpta. Apud Administrationem "Ephemeridum Liturgicarum", Romae. Pp. 179.

MISSA ET ABSOLUTIO PRO DEFUNCTIS tribus vocibus virilibus (vel etiam Soprano, Alto et Barytono, cum Tenore ad libitum) comitante organo, concinenda Pietro A. Yon. (Editio Fischer, No. 4350.) J. Fischer & Brother, New York. 1917. Pp. 36. Price: score, \$0.80; voice parts, \$0.35 each.

SHORT AND EASY REQUIEM IN E MINOR. For One Voice with Alto, Tenor, and Bass ad lib. By W. P. Schilling, Organist, St. Peter's Cathedral. Second edition transposed to D Minor. W. P. Schilling, 131 W 23rd St., New York. 1914. Pp. 19. Price, \$0.80.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE SOLDIER'S SERVICE DICTIONARY OF ENGLISH AND FRENCH TERMS. Embracing 10,000 Military, Naval, Aeronautical, Aviation and Conversational Words and Phrases used by the Belgian, British and French Armies. With their French equivalents, carefully pronounced, the whole arranged in one alphabetical order. Designed especially for instant use in the United States Service. With the pronunciations indicated by the Continental System of Vowel Values—One Symbol for Each Sound throughout the Alphabet—used in *Funk & Wagnalls' New Standard Dictionary*. Edited by Frank H. Vizetelly, Litt.D., LL.D., Managing Editor of *The New Standard Dictionary*, Member of the Royal Society of Arts, London, etc. Illustrated with Topographical Symbols used in Official Charts. Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York and London. 1917. Pp. xii—188. Price, \$1.00 net.

CATHOLIC HOME ANNUAL FOR 1918. Thirty-fifth year. Benziger Bros., New York. 1917. Pp. 86. Price, \$0.25.

THUNDER AN' TURF. By the Rev. Mark O'Byrne. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1917. Pp. 127. Price, \$0.46 *postpaid*.

BALLADS OF PEACE IN WAR. By Michael Earls, S.J. Harrigan Press, Inc., Worcester, Mass. 1917. Pp. 72. Price, *postpaid*: \$0.55; cloth, illustrated, \$1.05.

LUCKY BOB. By Francis J. Finn, S.J., author of *Tom Playfair*, *Percy Wynn*, *Claud Lightfoot*, etc. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 248. Price, \$1.00.

YEAR BOOK FOR 1917. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D. C. Pp. xvii—217.

ST. BONAVENTURE SEMINARY YEAR BOOK FOR 1917. Edited by the Duns Scotus Theological Society. Published by the Students of St. Bonaventure's Seminary, Alleghany, St. Bonaventure P. O., New York. Pp. 183.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SIXTH SERIES.—VOL. VII.—(LVII).—DECEMBER, 1917.—No. 6.

DEVOTION TO THE DIVINE INFANT.

THE devotion to Jesus the Divine Child is very specially suited to the needs of the present age. Without doubt it will render powerful help in remedying the evils of modern society, and in delivering the world from the miserable state into which it has fallen. Pride and worldliness appear to be the two great curses of our time. The nations have not become Protestant. But a crude, rationalistic spirit, which is the outcome of heresy, has pervaded everywhere. This spirit is proud and worldly. It is proud; it is begotten of and it lives on pride. The modern world, in ignoring and despising the authority of the Church, flouts the "pillar and the ground of Truth"; and it has been rightly said that humility is truth.

This spirit is worldly also; for, knowing not of God or heavenly things, it has nothing left to fall back on but self and what is earthly. If we consider the daily life of the world of our time, we shall see how deeply rooted and how widespread are these two vices. Everywhere there is overbearing pride—pride of riches and of power, pride of culture and of learning, pride of dignity and place, pride of race and of empire. And outside the number of the faithful, who is there that seeks the things of the Kingdom of Heaven? Alas! even amongst Catholics how few there are comparatively whose chief desire is not after amusement and worldly pleasure! Now the devotion to Jesus the Divine Child furnishes a cure for these evils. It provides a remedy for human pride and an antidote for the worldliness of men's hearts. The ultimate aim of the devotion is to teach men the heavenly virtues that are manifested in the Person of Jesus as a Child.

It cannot be doubted that it is amongst the dispositions of God's merciful Providence over us, that Jesus, His Incarnate Son, should be our Teacher and the Model for our lives. Of Himself Jesus said: "I am the Way", to wit, of holiness and virtue, to happiness and heaven. And the Apostle exhorts the Corinthians, and through them all Christians, that they be followers of him, as he is of Christ. Jesus has indeed instructed us. During the years of His public ministry He delivered the wonderful truths contained in His divine message. He teaches us the virtues that should adorn our souls especially and most powerfully by His own blessed example. At every period of His sacred life He is a model for us of all holiness; but it was particularly at Bethlehem and Nazareth He taught us how to live. Indeed it is not easy to discover any other object He had in view during the long years of His childhood and youth, than that He might become the model for our lives.

Now the first thing that strikes us in the Child Jesus is His wondrous humility. Who can fathom the depth of the humility of the Incarnate Son of God! We are humble when we lay no claim to greatness and esteem ourselves to be lowly. Humility is truth. And it is absolutely true that we are all lowly in ourselves. We are all deficient in many ways; and it is pride for any man to lay claim to real greatness. Human greatness is only relative. Human learning is great only when compared with error or absolute ignorance. Strength of body or mind is great in comparison with weakness or complete impotence. It matters not what our accomplishments or good qualities may be, if we wish to acknowledge the truth, we can never claim to be really great. Our gifts may be very precious and numerous in the order of grace, but, notwithstanding all our knowledge and virtue, it is still true that we are lowly in and of ourselves. When we think of the regions of the blessed, the abode of the Powers and Principalities, the Kingdom of God, all human greatness pales into insignificance. What is all our strength of virtue compared with the power and perfection of God! What is all human science and learning in comparison with the heavenly knowledge of the blessed spirits! Our knowledge is but the reflection of a shadow. All creation is like a shadow—the shadow of God. Lacordaire says somewhere, speaking of truth, which of course embraces all knowl-

edge and learning, that it is in our minds as if in the state of apparition, or that it is in our minds as the sun is in our eyes.

But even if our good qualities could stand comparison with what is true and lasting greatness, we should still be compelled to acknowledge our littleness. For these are not our substance: they are not our own. All power is from God, and every good thing is from above. Thus it is that, notwithstanding their lofty virtues, the saints are able with perfect truth to ascribe to themselves only lowliness and nothingness. God gives us the very energy whereby we think and act. Our poor correspondence, when seen in the light of God's creative, vivifying, actualizing power, seems scarcely deserving of consideration. It weighs with Him because His regard for our littleness is exceeding, and His love for us knows no bounds. It is true therefore that we are lowly: and humility is a virtue that should adorn every man.

How wonderful then is the humility of Jesus! He was truly great: but He appeared lowly. Yea, He is the source of all greatness and goodness: yet He became like to a worm and no man. He was really clothed with our lowly humanity, it is true; at the same time He was God; but He concealed His Divinity—and concealed It under the miserable cloak of our poor human nature. He allowed Himself to be known as the Son of a poor carpenter; and yet He was verily the only-begotten of the Eternal. He submitted to the laws of our common humanity; still He was the Giver of the Law and the Lord of life. He became subject and obedient to Mary and Joseph; and nevertheless He was truly the Master of the universe, and all things obeyed Him at a beck, and the angels invisibly ministered unto Him. He stooped even as low as to be born in a cave that was used for beasts; yet His rightful and natural home was the glorious Kingdom of Heaven. To all outward appearance He possessed scarcely the bare necessities of life; still in very truth His were the riches of the Godhead.

But this was not all. He concealed also the greatness of His Sacred Humanity. In the crib He appeared subject to all the weaknesses of infancy: and indeed in His bodily members He was weak and feeble as a little babe. His early years too seemed to be, and they were in reality, accompanied with all the corporal infirmities of childhood. But it was different as:

regards His soul. In this respect He appeared to resemble other children. But it was not so. Only on the occasion of His visit to the Temple, when He astonished the doctors by the wisdom of His words, did He manifest publicly His wondrous powers. Nevertheless we can say on the authority of the Fathers of the Church that even as He lay a helpless little Infant in the manger, His soul was endowed with all virtue, and His intellect possessed of knowledge more wonderful than that of the greatest philosopher or scientist that ever lived.

The unworldliness of the Child Jesus is scarcely less striking than His humility. He was verily the Son of God; and were we to judge according to human standards, we should expect that He would be born of a rich and noble queen: yet His Mother was a poor Jewish maid, and His reputed father a simple carpenter. He was the Messiah, the King of the Jews, and the Redeemer of the human race; and it would seem but fitting to receive Him into a magnificent palace, and herald His coming with all the dignity and pomp and grandeur becoming a royal and divine personage: still when He was about to be born into this world, His poor Mother was unable to find Him a shelter or a pillow whereon to lay His head. He is the Lord of the universe and the Father of the world to come; and one would think that He should be surrounded by courtiers and waited on by servants. But it was not so; for He had no one to attend to His wants except Mary and Joseph. Neither was He, like the children of the great ones of this world, brought up in luxury, feasted with delicacies, entertained with worldly pleasures and amusements, and made the recipient of the flattery and the praise of men. Rather He was reared in poverty and want; His life was spent hidden and unknown at Bethlehem and Nazareth, and He disdained not to assist daily at the lowly occupations of His parents.

In the present-day world, both with young and old, the main pursuit in life seems to be pleasure and worldly amusement. If the life of the Child Jesus were seriously and prayerfully meditated on, what a blessed reformation would be effected! For a certainty they would learn that the joys of this time are passing and deceptive, and that our hearts and minds should be ever turned toward what is heavenly and eternal. And if the proud ones of this world would religiously ponder

over the exceeding condescension and humility of Jesus, what a blessed lesson they would learn! Oh, ye learned! Why do you boast and wish to appear great and be called wise?—seeing that this little Child was possessed of greater and far more wonderful science than yours: and yet He was silent, and remained hidden and unknown at Nazareth. Oh, ye proud statesmen and rulers of the present day! why do you arrogate to yourselves all power, and flout an authority that is greater and higher than your own?—seeing that the Son of God Himself, the Lord of the world and the King of kings, deigned to be subject to the powers of earth, and rendered obedience to Mary and Joseph. In our days an unhealthy ambition and the desire of honors and notoriety seem to be in very great part the motive power in the matter of education. What a salutary effect would be produced in the children and youth of our schools and colleges, if they were taught to imitate the humility of Jesus!

Teachers, especially those of Religious Congregations, can very easily promote the grand work of propagating this beautiful devotion. It will be introduced and spread in seminaries and the preparatory houses and novitiates of Religious with excellent fruit. But perhaps the most effective way to further the devotion is to have established in the churches a Confraternity or Sodality of Jesus, the Divine Child, for children. General Communion, at least monthly, should be one of the rules of the Sodality; and a special feature of the meetings of the little ones ought to be an instruction on the virtues of the Divine Child.

This devotion is particularly suited to the present age; but it is a devotion that is at all times very pleasing to God and profitable to those who practise it. If we consider the devotion as it renders homage and adoration to the Divine Child, we shall see that it is eminently appropriate. Jesus is worthy of adoration and endless praise. As a child His blessed soul was adorned with all virtue and His mind far more enlightened than that of the most learned of this world. He is the most beautiful amongst the sons of men. And even in the flesh He is adored by the angels. But He is more than man. Jesus is the Word Incarnate, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, and equal in power and glory and grandeur with the

Eternal Father Himself. Thus He is entitled to our worship and most profound adoration.

Under the aspect of supplication, the devotion may appear to some critical minds to be unreal. It may be said that Jesus is no longer a child. It is true indeed that as He sits now on the right hand of His Father in Heaven, He is endowed with all the perfection of mature manhood. But there never was any change in the Divine Person of Jesus. There was the same immutable Personality in the Man as in the Child. Jesus is the same yesterday and to-day and for ever. It is clear of course that the Child grew, as to His bodily members, into the perfect Man. But even in the matter of His Humanity, we have the authority of the Fathers for saying that there was no development in the infused knowledge and the virtue of the soul of Jesus. It is unnecessary, however, to enter more fully into these questions here. The objection against the devotion has no weight. The prayers of the devout clients of the Divine Child are directed to the Person of Jesus, or to the Eternal Father; and their confidence is founded on the merits of the Sacred Infancy. The countless miracles worked through the devotion are sufficient proof that it rests on a solid basis.

The relation of some of the wonderful favors obtained from the Divine Child will prove most effective in spreading the devotion amongst the faithful.

HISTORY.

The first worshippers of the Divine Child are familiar figures to everyone. Before He had founded His Church, they paid Jesus their homage during the years He dwelt amongst us still clothed with our mortal flesh. His Blessed Virgin Mother and His Foster Father were His first adorers. Mary and Joseph recognized the wonderful things God had done through them. And whilst Jesus was yet unborn and after His birth at Bethlehem, in Egypt, and at Nazareth, they ever lovingly praised and worshipped in their hearts the Divine Person who had verily become the Child of Mary's womb and who deigned to be the Foster Son of Joseph. St. Luke tells us that on the night of the wondrous birth, an angel appeared to some shepherds, who were keeping the night watches over their flocks, announcing to them the joyful tidings of the coming

of the Saviour. The shepherds hastened over to Bethlehem, and entering the cave rendered their homage to the new-born King. We learn from another Evangelist that the Magi also worshipped the Divine Child. Following a wonderful star which appeared to them in the East, they journeyed the whole way to Bethlehem, and having found out the Child Jesus they fell down and adored Him, offering their gifts of gold, frankincense, and myrrh. Holy Simeon also and Anna the prophetess saw in Mary's Child the Saviour of the world, and they publicly glorified God in Him. Doubtless many of the intimate friends of Mary and Joseph when they beheld Jesus, praised God and worshipped the Divine Child in their hearts. Perhaps also it is not unreasonable to believe that some of those who heard Him disputing with the doctors in the Temple, recognized in Him the Messiah, and that they paid Him silent but profound homage.

In the earlier ages of the Church we have evidence of the devotion of individual saints to the Divine Child. Saint Jerome had very great devotion to the mysteries of the birth and childhood of Jesus. He even went to dwell in Bethlehem; and he took up his abode close by the cave wherein the Divine Babe was born. We are told that St. Bernard had great devotion to the Holy Infancy also. Jesus seems to wish very particularly to be honored as a child. There are many instances in the lives of the saints in which He deigned to appear to chosen souls as a little one. Everyone is familiar with the figure of St. Antony. Murillo has left us a charming picture of the vision of Châteauneuf, in which we see the Infant Jesus, surrounded with a halo of dazzling light, appearing to the Saint of Padua. We are also given an account of a delightful apparition of the Divine Child to St. Teresa. The Venerable Francis of the Child Jesus, a Carmelite lay brother who lived in the sixteenth century, had wonderful devotion to the Holy Infant. This saintly religious was accustomed to provide a feast for the poor every Christmas Day. It is related that one year provisions were scarce when the time of the usual feast was at hand; and he had nothing for his poor. But the holy Brother did not lose hope. He prayed to the Child Jesus. And lo! an unknown person appeared at the door of the monastery and gave him plenty of money to provide the customary feast.

Before the seventeenth century the worship of the Divine Child does not seem to have spread to any extent as a popular devotion amongst the faithful. It may be that God wished to reserve it for these later centuries, when there seems to be greater need than perhaps ever before that men should learn to become as little children. The instrument which God used to propagate this beautiful devotion was the Venerable Margaret of the Blessed Sacrament, a Carmelite of Beaune, who died in 1648 at the age of twenty-eight years, seventeen of which she spent in Carmel. We are told in the life¹ of this remarkable nun that one day the Child Jesus appeared to her and said: ". . . I have chosen thee to honor my Infancy . . . I will show thee the manner in which I wish thou should'st honor it, and cause it to be honored on earth". On the day of her profession she had a beautiful vision in which she beheld, in the midst of rays of light, the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity, under the form of a new-born infant, who said to her: "I have witnessed with joy the act of thy religious engagement; and I choose thee for the special spouse of my infancy". This holy nun, we are told, obtained wonderful favors from God through her devotion to the Holy Infancy. In 1636 France was scourged as now with the awful horrors of war. The enemy had entered the province of Burgundy, and the town of Beaune was threatened with siege. Amidst general panic Sister Margaret remained calm and confident. "The Divine Child Jesus," she said, "will restore order as you will soon know; for He watches over the town and will prepare infallible aid." In truth things turned out as the holy nun had predicted. The queen, Anne of Austria, wife of Louis XIII, recommended herself to the prayers of Sister Margaret. She had been married twenty-three years, but was childless. She asked the saintly religious to obtain from God an heir to the crown of France. Sister Margaret promised to pray, and she told the queen with simplicity that the Child Jesus would soon give an heir to the throne. And indeed so it came to pass. The holy nun became supernaturally aware of the event and made it known to the community. Thus the people of Beaune were already rejoicing over the royal birth when the announcement reached them from Paris.

¹ From the French of Mgr. Fliche. (M. & S. Eaton, Dublin, 1892.)

Sister Margaret devoted her whole life to the propagation of the devotion to the Divine Infant. One day at prayer our Lord made her understand that she should establish an association in honor of the Holy Infancy. The holy Sister submitted the project to her superioress, and with the consent of the latter she founded the "Association or Confraternity of the Child Jesus". It consisted of nine of the religious, in honor of the nine months Jesus spent in the chaste womb of His Virgin Mother. This Association thus formed by this humble nun in the calm and quiet of Carmel soon became widely known and increased rapidly in numbers. Later on, the Confraternity of the Holy Infancy was canonically established by the Bishop of Autun.

Another effect of the zeal of Sister Margaret for the devotion to the Child Jesus was the erection of a sanctuary in His honor. The idea came to her mind one morning after prayer. She trembled with joy at the thought, and wished to realize it at once. She had no material means, however, to carry out her design; and, Carmelite nun as she was, she had little opportunity of communication with seculars. But God knows how to provide the means to accomplish the holy enterprises which He inspires. The holy nun was brought into touch with several persons who, without being asked, offered to contribute to the realization of her pious project. Thus Sister Margaret succeeded in building the chapel which was publicly and solemnly blessed and dedicated to the Divine Child. This holy sanctuary became famous not only throughout Burgundy but in all parts of France. Associated with Sister Margaret in the work of spreading the devotion to the Divine Child was Father Olier, the founder of the seminary of St. Sulpice. This holy priest had the office of the Holy Infant recited in the seminary by twelve of the most fervent and zealous ecclesiastics. Thus the devotion was also established in the parish of St. Sulpice, where the office of the Divine Child was recited on the twenty-fifth of each month. In order to render the function more solemn, one of the priests, who became afterward Archbishop of Cambrai, the illustrious Fénelon, composed litanies of the Infant Jesus, which were sung after the vespers of the Divine Child.

THE CHILD JESUS OF PRAGUE.²

The miraculous statue of the Child Jesus of Prague seems to have been the means which God used to make the devotion of the Holy Infancy known and practised in all parts of the world. This statue was given to the Barefooted Carmelites of Prague in 1628, by a pious princess, named Polixena de Lobkowitz. The precious gift was bestowed in the following circumstances. The Prague foundation of the Carmelites was made by Ferdinand II. This convent, with some others, was established by the Emperor in recognition of the services rendered by Father Dominic of Jesus Mary in the war which ended victoriously for the Austrians on the 8 November, 1620. When this monastery had been established, seeing that it would not be possible for the religious to live without some revenue, the emperor wished to make provision for them in this direction. But the fervent community, trusting in God's providence, respectfully refused the generous offer. Thus it came to pass that they found themselves in extreme want, oftentimes not having enough bread to eat. At this time there was at Prague the pious princess already referred to. She became aware of the great distress of the Carmelite Fathers; and she knew also doubtless the reason they refused the generous offer of the emperor. Accordingly she devised another means of coming to their aid. There was in her possession a statue of the Divine Child to which she attached the greatest value. Bringing this to the convent, she said to the Prior: "Father, I give you my most precious treasure. Honor this Child Jesus, and you will want for nothing." The Divine Child was greatly honored in the convent. And the words of the pious donor were quickly and wonderfully fulfilled. Very soon all the material needs of the religious were supplied, and God showered down upon them spiritual favors abundantly as well. Here then begins the history of the miracles worked by the Infant Jesus of Prague.

The bloody conflict which ended victoriously for the Austrians in November, 1620, proved unfortunately to be but the beginning of the Thirty Years' War. Hostilities soon again broke out in Bohemia. The city of Prague capitulated.

² Cf. *Histoire de la statue miraculeuse du Saint Enfant Jésus de Prague*. (Paul Godenne, Namur, 1894).

lated. The Church of Our Lady of Victory, which was given by the emperor to the Carmelites with the foundation, was pillaged; and the statue of the Divine Infant was broken and desecrated. During these sad and terrible years the sacred image remained hidden and unknown. Again, however, in 1637 we find the Carmelites back in their convent at Prague. This same year there was sent to join the Prague community Father Cyril, who formerly as a novice at Prague was most devoted to the Divine Infant and whose name is inseparably connected with the devotion to the Child Jesus. But alas! he found Prague in consternation: enemy troops were about to besiege the city. The statue of the Child Jesus was nowhere in evidence in the convent. This holy religious set himself to find the precious treasure. At last he discovered it, amidst rubbish, behind the altar of an interior oratory in the monastery. He wept on beholding the disrespect and irreverence to which the holy image had been subjected, and hastened to have it restored to the veneration of the religious. Full of confidence, the entire community fell on their knees and implored the Infant Jesus to be their refuge, their strength, their succor, in the terrible tribulations which had come upon them. The statue was scarcely restored to its place of honor in the choir when the enemy suddenly raised the siege; and all the wants of the convent were wonderfully provided for. Naturally these marvellous happenings greatly increased the devotion of the religious toward the Divine Child. These wonders were followed by others. And soon the fame of the statue spread. The devotion became the source of numerous favors and blessings to the faithful.

A strange thing happened during the feast of Christmas 1639. The miraculous statue was exposed for the veneration of the people in the Church of the Carmelites. A lady was taken by the striking beauty of the statue, and she conceived a desire to possess it. She contrived therefore with the aid of others to steal it. But the crime did not go unpunished. God visibly chastised the perpetrators in a terrible way. The sacred image was restored to the Carmelites after some time.

More than once the Carmelite Fathers had promised to erect a special sanctuary for the Divine Infant. On one of these occasions they were praying to avert a dreadful calamity

from the empire. In the year 1640, the Swedish army tried to carry out the audacious design of seizing the emperor and the members of the imperial court. Numerous battalions were advancing by forced marches to effect the plan. The Governor of Bohemia, terrified at the imminent danger, hastened to the Carmelite convent to request that prayers be offered to the Divine Child to save them from the threatened calamity. Day and night the religious prayed before the miraculous statue, promising, if their petitions were heard, that they would erect a new chapel and have a great number of Masses said in honor of the Child Jesus. Quite unexpectedly and suddenly the temperature changed, and with the weather thus interfering with their operations, the enemy was unable to carry out their design. They were forced to beat a retreat in order to escape from the imperial troops who arrived from all parts. In fulfilment of their promises and in gratitude for the great favors obtained, a private chapel was built for the Divine Infant. The earnest desires of the people were that the statue should be publicly exposed; still it remained within the cloister, except on special occasions when it was brought into the church of the monastery for the veneration of the faithful. The new chapel was blessed by the prior of the convent on the feast of the Holy Name, 1644. For the greater glory of the Divine Child it was blessed solemnly by the Cardinal Archbishop of Prague on 3 May, 1648.

As is usual with the works of God, the devotion met with opposition. Notwithstanding the numerous and indisputable miracles through a long series of years, there were some who said the devotion was not sound. To put an end to the regrettable discussions which had arisen amongst the religious, the General of the Order in 1651 made a visit to Prague, to inquire into the origin and nature of the devotion. The result was a complete vindication of the beautiful devotion. The General imposed silence on its opponents, and recommended it earnestly to all.

The statue was solemnly crowned on 4 April, 1655, in the Church of Our Lady of Victory, by the auxiliary bishop of Prague. During all these years miracles multiplied, and the devotion continued to increase. In order to satisfy the great desires of the faithful that the statue should be given to public

reverence, a chapel was erected, through the generosity of the Counts of Talemberg, in the church of the Carmelites. It was consecrated on 16 July, 1655, by the archbishop. The devotion continued still to spread, and wonderful miracles were recorded from day to day. Early in the eighteenth century we find statues and images of the Divine Child of Prague being sent even to India and China. The Holy Child had occupied the Talemberg chapel eighty-four years when it was decided to provide a more spacious one, as the old chapel was proving too small for the number of the clients of the Infant Jesus.

The devotion received a set-back in the reign of Joseph II. The sanctuary of the Divine Child suffered also from the wicked enterprises of this enemy of the veneration of sacred images. Fortunately, however, the Church of Our Lady of Victory escaped the fate of many of the churches which were given over to profane usages. It was made a parish church. But the Carmelites were no longer allowed to watch over it. From this time to the present it has been faithfully served by the religious of the Order of Malta. The set-back to the devotion was only temporary. Joseph II passed away, and with him his wicked regulations. The miracles did not cease. They have continued through the nineteenth century and down to our own time. The devotion goes on flourishing and it has spread throughout the whole world.

THE CONFRATERNITY OF THE DIVINE INFANT.

We have already seen that the Venerable Carmelite, Sister Margaret of the Blessed Sacrament, established the Association of the Divine Child in the convent at Beaune. Soon it was canonically erected as a Confraternity by the Bishop of Autun. The Confraternity was approved and enriched with indulgences by Pope Alexander VII, on 24 January, 1661. After the French Revolution it was reëstablished by the Bishop of Dijon, 26 December, 1821. Pius IX granted new indulgences on 27 July, 1855; and finally the Association was raised to the dignity of an arch-confraternity in December of this same year by the same Pontiff. An important development took place a few years ago. In 1913 Pius X gave power to the General of the Discalced Carmelites to erect the Confra-

ternity under the title of the Divine Infant of Prague. The decree of the late Pope seems to contain the first official use or recognition of the word "Prague" in connexion with the Confraternity.³

The statutes of the Confraternity were approved by the Sacred Congregation of the Council in 1913. The official manual prescribes that the names of members of the Confraternity be inscribed in the register at enrolment; that the medal of the Divine Infant, blessed and imposed by the priest in the act of enrolment, be worn round the neck or carried about the person in some other becoming way; and that the "Glory be to the Father," etc., with the aspiration, "Divine Infant Jesus, bless us!" be recited thrice daily. Members are exhorted to be diligent in attending the devotions in honor of the Divine Child held on the twenty-fifth of each month, and especially on the solemn Feast of the Confraternity, the first Sunday after the Circumcision, or other day fixed for the celebration. Likewise they are exhorted to receive frequently the Blessed Eucharist, especially on the feasts of our Lord and the twenty-fifth of each month. The members can gain a large number of plenary indulgences. Parish priests and rectors of churches may obtain permission to establish the Confraternity by writing to the General of the Discalced Carmelites, (Corso d'Italia, 38, Rome), enclosing a letter from the Ordinary expressing his consent. In the petition the name of the diocese, place, patron of the church, and the priest who with the consent of the Ordinary is to be deputed director of the Confraternity, should be clearly stated.

BARTHOLD MULLEADY, O.D.C.

Dublin, Ireland.

POPE BENEDIOT XV AND THE FRANCISCANS.

THE reigning Pontiff recently recalled the fact that he joined the Third Order of St. Francis in the Convent of Aracoeli in Rome on 11 October, 1882, and how, in 1901, then known as Monsignor Giacomo Della Chiesa, he was elected a member of the Sacerdotal Association of the Third

³ There is a miraculous statue in the convent at Beaune. It is quite different in appearance from the Prague statue.

Order, established in the Eternal City by the late illustrious Capuchin, Cardinal Vives y Tuto. He is one of the many occupants of the papal chair who have held the Third Order in high esteem, and regarded it as a privilege to belong to the least of the Orders which perpetuate the spirit, teaching, and influence of the Saint of Assisi. Pope Honorius III verbally approved of its Rule in 1221; Gregory IX, in a brief dated 2 June, 1230, defended the tertiaries and renewed the exemptions and privileges accorded by his predecessor; Nicholas IV solemnly confirmed the Rule by a pontifical bull in 1289; Benedict XIV, many years later, ratified the favors accorded to the Third Order by the Holy See; and Leo XIII, in our own time, recast the Rule and broadened its scope without detracting anything from the nature of the Order, which remains unchanged and intact, in the New Constitution which he gave it, after warmly commending it in the Encyclical *Auspicato* of 17 September, 1882.

The present Pope has, however, ties with the Franciscan Order which date much farther back. Among his ancestors five of the Della Chiesa belonged to the Capuchin branch of the Order. The Rev. Dr. Frédegand Callaey, archivist general of that Order, in an interesting pamphlet in Italian,¹ has traced the relations of the family of His Holiness Benedict XV with the Capuchins. The first to put on the brown habit was Father Angelo Della Chiesa, son of Bernardino Della Chiesa and Caterina Pavese di Antonio, both noble citizens of Savona. Born in 1498 and dying in 1556, he lived at a time when truly religious men were much needed to introduce a renovating spirit of holiness into the decadent society of the epoch both in Church and State; for it was the age when the Borgias scandalized the world by their depravity. Father Bernardino of Colpetrazzo, one of the earliest chroniclers of the Order, speaks of him as having been in his youth much devoted to literary studies and a good humanist, and at the same time to have led the life of a religious even when in the world. He was hardly seventeen when he joined the Observantines in Milan,

¹ *La Famiglia di S. S. Benedetto XV e l'Ordine dei Frati Minori Cappuccini* dal P. Fredegando Callaey da Anversa, Dottore in scienze morali e storiche dell'Università di Lovano, Archivista Generale del medesimo Ordine. Roma, 1916.

and was ordained between 1520 and 1525. Being of delicate health he could not devote himself with as much ardor as, in his first fervor, he would have wished. His father died in 1535; and it is indicative of the strict view his parents took of the religious life, that his mother in her will left him only a very small bequest, because, as she said, "being dead to the world my son Angelo has neither to ask nor to receive". It was about that time he heard of the nascent Capuchin reform or movement toward a return to the primitive observances, from which the various branches into which the Franciscan Order was split up had more or less strayed. The eloquent Father Giovanni de Fano, who when minister provincial of the Observantines in the March of Ancona strongly opposed the movement, had altered his views, and in 1535 joined the Capuchins, whom he introduced into Lombardy. He founded convents successively at Bergamo, Brescia, Milan, Brigorio, Erba, and at San Martino outside Monza. The reform spread, and in less than five years was received in the Republic of Genoa. Establishing themselves in 1530 in the city which proudly calls itself "superb", the Capuchins were welcomed in Savona in 1539. Like many other Observantines, Father Angelo was impressed by the rapid and prodigious diffusion of the Order, instituted by Padre Matteo de Bassio of Urbino in 1525 and approved by Clement VIII in 1528, and which, despite much opposition from relaxed religious, was attracting to itself all those earnestly desirous of carrying out the Franciscan Rule in its integrity. When Father Angelo, who was one of these, saw that the superiors of the Observantines refused to remodel the conventual life in the spirit of the reform, he followed the example of many of his brethren and went over to the Capuchins. It was in 1541, the year they held their chapter in Naples. His time was divided between filling the office of lector at Bergamo and preaching.

The Capuchins in the beginning had not only to bear the Cross of contradiction, but the still heavier cross of sad defections. Thus they were left then for a time under a cloud of suspicion and calumny. The too celebrated Bernardino Ochino of Siena, their vicar general, a famous orator, apostatized and joined the Calvinists in Geneva, and Girolamo Muzio left them because he could not obtain the purple. The sins

of the few who fell away were visited upon the many who remained steadfast; the poor friars were branded as hypocrites, and they had to bow their heads until the storm passed and the cloud which overshadowed them was lifted. The outlook for the Order was for a time very gloomy; so much so that Paul III thought of suppressing it. But Cardinal Sanseverino defended the innocent brethren, and succeeded in having an inquiry into their conduct made. It resulted in favor of the Capuchins. To make more certain of their orthodoxy, Cardinal Carpi suspended for some months the preaching friars from fulfilling that function; but faculties were restored to all who passed successfully a second examination and bound themselves in writing to preach only on doctrines contained in a profession of faith, to the exclusion of every suspected or temerarious opinion.²

It was under these painful circumstances that Father Angelo Della Chiesa effectively contributed to regain for his Order the credit it had temporarily lost with the clergy and people. In 1543 he was received in audience at Piacenza by Paul III, who personally licensed him to preach, although the silence imposed on the Order was not yet withdrawn. He at once preached in Milan and its environs, showing the people, as Mattia da Salo, one of the historians of the Order, phrases it, "that it was not the doves' fault if one vulture was found among them". His grave bearing and prudence confirmed the truth of his words. As deputy to the General Chapter held in Rome in 1543, he took a prominent part in that assembly. Father Francis of Iesi, elected Minister General on 12 May, 1543, sent him to Venice to neutralize the bad effect produced by Ochino's preaching during the previous year. Father Bernard of Asti, elected General on 4 June, 1546, summoned him to Rome, where he preached with great success the Lenten sermons in the church of San Lorenzo in Damaso, many Cardinals going to hear him. "He helped much to dispel the bad odor left by Ochino," observes Mattia. He then returned to Venice, where for a few years he was guardian, and where he gained the confidence and gratitude of the people. One day he obtained from the Signoria the liberation of a Turk

² *Narratione dell'Origine della Congregazione de Frati Capucini da Frate Mario Vecchio da Mercato Saraceno del medemo ordine.*

condemned to the galleys and made a convert of him. On another occasion a valuable gold necklet, belonging to a noble Venetian lady, was recovered in a very remarkable way, thanks to the continuous prayers of Father Angelo, and his brethren. It had fallen into the water when she was in a gondola, and, fearing that her husband might hear of it, earnestly besought the friars' prayers. She was a benefactress of the convent, and one day sent them a big fish. The brother-cook, on opening it, found in its stomach the necklet, which was restored to the lady. The moral the pious chronicler who tells the story drew from the incident is, that it shows the efficacy of almsgiving and prayer when these virtuous actions are joined together.

The fame he acquired by his eloquence and virtues reached many other cities, and they eagerly sought to have the benefit of his presence, preaching, and devout example. He visited Naples, Fermo, Macerata, Ascoli and Genoa, where his exhortations reaped great fruit. Tall, fair-complexioned and of stately appearance, but always with a joyful countenance, suavity of manners and pleasing conversation, he was so gracious that no one, however melancholy or afflicted, left him without being consoled. It was chiefly in Bologna, however, that his preaching and example produced the best effects. He founded there the first convent of his Order and, despite certain prejudices, gained for himself and his brethren the love and veneration of the Bolognese. After preaching during the Advent of 1553 in the Cathedral of St. Peter, he was invited the following year to be the Lenten preacher in the celebrated pulpit of San Petronio. He gave such satisfaction to his numerous auditors that the Senate determined to permit the Capuchins to establish themselves near Bologna and found a convent there. The municipal Council bought the summit of the beautiful Belvidere hill outside the Porta San Mamolo from its owners the Manzoli family and, with the consent of the bishop, Alessandro Campeggi, offered it to Father Angelo. Assisted by three of his brethren and amid the rejoicings of a devout gathering he erected a cross there on 14 September, 1554, the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, when the name of the hill was changed to Monte Calvario. Soon after, a retreat for penitence and prayer was erected there. His

exemplary life silenced all calumniators. When the report spread of his having cured a poor person mortally wounded and by the sign of the Cross restored to health a boy stricken with a nervous malady, the Bolognese had recourse with great assiduity to the friars on Monte Calvario, thronging thither in such crowds as greatly to disturb the community when reciting the Office in choir or making mental prayer. To allay the disturbance they had to put up a notice at the convent promising the citizens that the prayers of the Capuchins would never fail them.

The founder of this Bologna convent was not the first of the Della Chiesa whose words and works benefited that city, nor the last. A century before that the inspiring language and saintly life of Antonio Della Chiesa, a Dominican, had given great edification to the citizens. Not many years ago, Cardinal Giacomo Della Chiesa, now Pope Benedict XV, still occupied the see of San Petronio, and supported by words and acts the apostolate begun in his archiepiscopal city by his ancestor, the Capuchin Father Angelo Della Chiesa.

At the epoch of the foundation of the Bologna convent, Father Angelo was without doubt one of the most eminent members of his Order. Bernardino of Colpetrazzo writes of him that he had from God the great gift of governing the friars. He was several times vicar in various provinces and definitor in the General Chapter, and also filled other functions, such as Commissary General. He would have wished to die in the city where the people showed him such veneration, in a poor cell of the convent he founded; but obedience called him elsewhere. In the beginning of 1555, Father Eusebius of Ancona sent him to preach the Lent in the Marches, where he remained a whole year, announcing the word of God with fruitful results in Fermo, Ascoli, Macerata, and other cities. His health broke down under the strain, and he sought rest and recuperation in the convent at Iesi in the spring of 1556; but all the care bestowed upon him by the brethren failed to revive him. Feeling his end drawing near, he wrote a moving letter to the General, thanking him for having sent him to the Marches, where, by the grace of God, he had been able to do so much good. "I have finished my course," he said. "I am leaving you and I commend myself to you; we

shall soon see each other in Paradise." A few days afterward, the 25 April, 1556, he passed to a better life, surrounded by his weeping brethren, profoundly edified by him in his last moments.

While his first biographers represent him as an exemplary religious, in whose external action there was nothing marvelous, subsequent writers make him a miracle-working saint. Bernardino of Colpetrazzo, who was for more than fifteen years his confrère, and who had certainly an opportunity of being well informed, says he was not a man of great austerity, being physically very weak, and no other miracles were discernible than the true and perfect observance of the Rule; but that such was his beautiful life that by the public voice and rumor he was reputed a holy man. Father Mattia da Salo, his second biographer, lays much stress upon the efficacy of his prayers and those of his brethren, pointing out how they obtained from the Lord two great favors, already noted. Boverio adopts a version in which he is described as a real saint, whose virtue God attested by extraordinary miracles. One day he met an unfortunate man so badly wounded by his enemies that his skull was split in two. Touched with compassion, with his left hand he compressed both parts together and with his right made over him the sign of the Cross, when the disjointed portions at once united and nothing remained of the wound but a cicatrice. On the same day he similarly cured a boy whose nerves were so affected that he could not move. Seeing the Capuchin passing, he asked him to cure him also with the sign of the Cross. Hardly had Father Angelo done so, when he stood up perfectly sound. These incidents took place in Bologna when the Capuchins still dwelt near the church of the Madonna delle Lame.³ A large number of other writers repeat them, while others pass them over in silence. The first account of these cures was given in a manuscript of the Capuchin Provincial of Bologna, referred to by Boverio, but it has unfortunately been lost. "With miracles or without miracles," concludes Father Frédegand Callaey,⁴ "he appears to us in any case as an eloquent and indefatigable champion of the Franciscan ideal

³ Z. Boverius, *Annales Minorum Capuccinorum*.

⁴ Op. cit., p. 32.

in the nascent and much-tried Capuchin Congregation. This is enough to propose him as an example and to preserve his memory in benediction."

Father Angelo's mother, née Caterina Pavese, had three sisters, one of whom married a gentleman who bore the name of one of the most conspicuous Savonese families—Multedo. From their union was born in 1518 a son who, like his cousin Angelo, entered the Capuchin Order. He was called Lodovico. Bernardino of Colpetrazzo, who knew him and in 1575 wrote a biographical sketch of him, relates that young Multedo was well indoctrinated by his parents and that when he grew up to manhood they were solicitous of placing him advantageously in the world; but he manifested an insurmountable distaste for the secular life and an earnest desire to enter religion. This preference was displeasing to them, for they desired for him a career that would reflect honor and distinction on the family. Their efforts to retain him in the world were fruitless; he preferred to listen to the voice of God which called him to choose the better part. About the age of eighteen he was admitted into the Congregation of the Theatine Regular Clerics founded in Rome in 1524 by Saint Gaetano Thiene; but, after three years spent among them, having one day heard a sermon on penance preached by a Capuchin, he decided to join that preacher's Order. He obtained permission from his religious superiors to do so and set out for Rome accompanied by a young native of Bergamo, who had felt the same attraction and was afterward known in the Capuchin Order as Father Antony of Bergamo. He received the habit in 1539, and was shortly after ordained. Held in much esteem, he was elected to take part in the fifth General Chapter held in Rome on 12 May, 1543. He there met his cousin Father Angelo. Boverio says both were among the twenty-four most conspicuous in that assembly: "men of great virtue and wisdom who have by their prudence and courage sustained and upheld the Reform, involved in so many troubles and almost cast down to the depths."⁵ The annalist calls Father Lodovico a man of continuous prayer and most praiseworthy for his self-contempt.

There appears to have been a great difference in character

⁵ By the apostacy of Ochino.

between the two cousins. While Father Angelo was above all things a man of action, a famous preacher, going from city to city to defend the reputation of his Order and establishing his brethren therein, filling important offices, Father Lodovico, on the other hand, was a most ardent lover of contemplation and of a retired life, avoiding everything that might deprive him of his peace of mind. His conversation was in heaven: he mingled with men through motives of charity only; seeking to be forgotten, to be held in little consideration, and asking to be employed only in the lowliest offices. Although he was a lettered man and a very capable pulpit orator, he preferred to preach the word of God in the humblest and most remote towns. When not engaged in the ministry, he remained in his cell or in the church, devoting himself to meditation. He was a second Brother Juniper in his simplicity, which was proverbial in the Roman province where he spent his whole religious life. The expression, "You are simpler than Fra Lodovico of Savona," was often used.

He was a most zealous observer of the Rule. His debility did not permit him to go barefoot; but, to make up for this, he fasted continually, rarely eating more than once in the day. In winter and summer he wore a coarse, rough habit like a hair shirt; only when the cold was very severe he put on a mantle of the coarsest cloth that could be found. He was one of the favorite popular preachers in the Roman Campagna, and was much in request for the pulpit. His peace of heart was contagious and communicated itself to his hearers; his superiors often sent him to places where discord reigned and he always succeeded in restoring good feeling. After much pressing they succeeded in getting him to accept the guardianship of the Roman friary, but he soon regretted it on account of the multiplicity of material preoccupations which it entailed and which made him lose his peace of soul. As it seemed to him that he could not fill it with that tranquillity of conscience which he preferred above any prelature, he went in all simplicity to his superior and humbly asked to be relieved of the charge. His resignation was accepted and he was sent to Savona. Father Bernardino of Colpetrazzo, meeting him in a convent on the way, and seeing that he was going homeward, said to him: "I am surprised that such a retired reli-

gious as you should have undertaken such a journey". He replied, smiling, "But I have done it to flee from the tumult of Rome; now I can without interruption keep my mind raised to God, and am doing rather better than when I remained in my convent; besides, I hope to do some good among my family." The particular motive of this journey is not disclosed: but he profited by it to urge his fellow citizens to adopt a more fervently religious life. During his sojourn in Savona he introduced the Quarant 'Ore, or Forty Hours' Adoration of the Blessed Sacrament.

On his return to Rome he was stricken with a serious malady and in a few days was reduced to extremities. His brethren then verified a very edifying fact narrated by the chronicler quoted. Shortly before dying he remained rapt for the space of an hour, so that many present thought he was dead. Then, coming to himself, he said with great joy to his brethren: "Know that I have been presented before the tribunal of Jesus Christ. The Just Judge has examined my defects and has received me among His elect; give me at once, as Viaticum, the Most Holy Sacrament." Having received the Blessed Eucharist with great devotion he expired, 24 January, 1564. He was buried in the convent of San Nicola de Portiis, in which he had spent the greater part of his twenty-five years in religion.

Father Angelo Della Chiesa and Father Lodovico Multedo had as one of their religious brethren a young man whose mother, a Pavese, was their aunt. "Of four ladies sisters," writes Father Mattia da Salo, "three had sons, and each of them had a Capuchin." The old chronicles and annals are silent about this cousin; Father Mattia alone makes mention of him. His name was Agapito and he was a cleric. He died young before reaching the priesthood.

Another Capuchin of the Della Chiesa family of Genoa was Father Giovanni Francesco Della Chiesa, who joined the Order on the feast of St. Francis, 4 October, 1721. The chronicles make very brief mention of him; only that he was noted as a preacher and confessor. He officiated chiefly in his native city, at the convent of St. Barnaba, and died in Genoa in 1766.

The most noteworthy of the Pope's relatives of later date was Father Giacomo Raggi of Genoa. When on 21 Septem-

ber, 1914, the Capuchin Curia Generalizia laid at the feet of his Holiness the expression of their sentiments of fidelity and devotion to the Holy See, Benedict XV, in his reply, recalled the ties of affection that since his childhood had attached him to the Franciscan Order. "At this moment," he said, "many recollections are revived in my memory. Perhaps few of those who are here present know that I had a relative in the Order who bore my own name. If I had had the vocation to put on your habit I would be Father Giacomo of Genoa, as my relative of the family of the Marquis Raggi was called. I remember having first manifested my vocation to the ecclesiastical state to him, who was a holy man and of the true Franciscan spirit; from him I then received advice and encouragement. So it may be said that from childhood I have cherished esteem and sympathy for your Order."

This Father Giacomo Raggi of Genoa, in the world Giacomo Filippo, son of the Marquis Giovanni Antonio Raggi, Minister of State to Charles Albert, and of Teresa Spinola, was born in Genoa on the 12 August, 1812. He had four sisters: Ersilia, Eugenia, Maria, and Giulia. Ersilia married the Marquis Migliorati and had a daughter, Giovanna, who married the Marquis Giuseppe Della Chiesa and became, on 21 November, 1854, the mother of the reigning Pontiff.

Young Raggi, after receiving his classical education from the Jesuits, moved in society, frequented the most aristocratic circles, and was much admired for his elegance. Though designed for a diplomatic career, his bent was for the Church, and after consulting the best spiritual directors, he decided to devote himself to the service of God and of souls in the Capuchin Order. At Eastertide, 1830, he sought admission therein at the Convent of St. Barnaba in Genoa, unknown to his parents, who first refused their consent, deeming his resolution hastily taken. Seeing him immovable, his mother begged him to select a less austere Order, and finally, after waiting six months, to test his firmness, gave the much desired consent. He received the habit on 3 November, 1830, retaining in religion his baptismal name, Giacomo. He was probably ordained at the Advent of 1837 and, after receiving faculties, was assigned to the convent of Chiavari. In 1843 he was sent to France to help some of his Genoese brethren

who were endeavoring to restore the Capuchin Order, suppressed by the Revolution. In 1844 he was made Guardian of Aix in Provence and novice master as well as spiritual director; at the Chapter held in the following year he was elected third definitor of the revived province. After a brief sojourn in Genoa in 1846, he was sent to Lyons. The climate there was too severe, and he was recalled to Aix in 1847, and from there he went back to his native province in Italy. He devoted himself principally to preaching until he had to withdraw from the pulpit owing to a malady which attacked the larynx. He then gave his whole time to the confessional. During his long religious career he was frequently invested with important offices, which shows the esteem in which he was held by the Order. After the suppression of the Religious Orders in 1866 he retired for some years to the Casa Pallavicini to his sister Eugenia; but when the community life was restored in the Genoese province he returned to his convent. Guardian of Campi on 9 June, 1869, he was elected first definitor and president of the Ospedale dei Cronici on 23 August, 1873; re-elected definitor in 1875 and 1878; guardian of Voltri S. Francesco on 21 October, 1879; again definitor on 27 June, 1884 and vicar of Foltri. There he ended a useful life by a holy death on 15 March, 1886, at the age of seventy-three.

The attraction to the religious life and devotion to the Holy See are traditional in the Della Chiesa family, who are of Milanese origin. They were strong adherents of the Papacy when the German Emperors, Henry IV, Frederick Barbarossa, and Frederick II, attacked the liberty and spiritual supremacy of the Church in the famous contest between the priesthood and the empire. The first who figured notably in an ecclesiastical career was Cardinal Gian Paolo Della Chiesa. Born at Tortona in 1521, after the death of his wife he entered the Church and placed himself at the service of Pope St. Pius V, the great Dominican Pontiff, the Pope whose name is linked with the momentous victory at Lepanto. He was nominated Abbot of San Pietro di Mulegio in the diocese of Vercelli, created Cardinal in 1566, and died in Rome during the conclave of 13 January, 1575. As senator of Milan he was deputed to represent the senate in the Pontifical Court in a case between the illustrious Cardinal St. Charles Borromeo

and the authorities of that city, and as Cardinal devoted himself zealously to the financing of the expedition against the Turks. Francesco Agostino Della Chiesa, who was born in Saluzzo in 1593 and who lived to the middle of the seventeenth century, was bishop of his native city. Following the example of his uncle Antonio he devoted his leisure to historical studies relating to Piedmont. Clemente Della Chiesa, a native of Acqui, was first Abbot of San Giovanni di Laniero in Nizza Monferrato, and was nominated Bishop of Acqui in 1646, but died suddenly in 1647 before he could be consecrated. Among other members of the family who were mitred were Diego, Bishop of Nizza from 1665 to 1669; Vittorio Niccolino, Bishop of Alba in 1667; Ignazio, Bishop of Casale in 1746; and Francesco Agostino, first almoner to Carlo Emmanuele III and then Bishop of Vigevano in 1757. Of those who dedicated themselves to the cloistral life was Antonio Della Chiesa. Born in San Germano near Vercelli in 1394, he early entered the Dominican Order. A man of great virtue and a remarkable preacher, it devolved upon him to form to the religious life his young brethren in the Convent of Piacenza. Successively Prior at Verona, Savona, Novi, Bologna, and Como, he strove earnestly to promote the regular observance according to the Dominican Constitutions. He died on 22 January, 1458 or 1459 and is venerated as a *Beato* in his Order. Francesco Scipione Della Chiesa, son of a Count of Cervignasca, embraced the austere life of a Cistercian. Born in 1549, he was elected vicar general of his Order in Italy before he reached the age of thirty; but died shortly after his election in 1578.

R. F. O'CONNOR.

Belfast, Ireland.

THE PRIEST AND NON-CATHOLICS.

I became all things to all men that I might save all.—1 Cor. 9: 22.

And other sheep I have that are not of this fold: them also I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.—*St. John, 10: 16.*

For my own part, I have always looked upon the entire population of the village as belonging to my parish endeavoring to bear in mind St. Augustine's illuminating distinction between the body and the soul of the Church.—*From Within My Parish.*

WHILE the title of this paper is for all practical purposes sufficiently descriptive of the paper's contents, it is so far inaccurate as to warrant the statement that by the term

"non-Catholics" is meant those who are outside the visible body of the Church. That not all of these are beyond the Church's invisible pale is a commonplace of theology, although it appears to be forgotten or ignored by an occasional Catholic preacher who expatiates on the traditional dictum, "Extra ecclesiam nulla salus". There is no minimizing of Catholic doctrine in the assertion that it is quite possible for professing Protestants to be in good faith; there is rather undue rigorism, to say nothing of a reprehensible lack of charity, in declaring that they all are, and must be, in *bad* faith. "Those", says Spirago, "who are brought up in Protestantism, and have no opportunity of obtaining a sufficient instruction in the Catholic religion, are not heretics in the sight of God, for in them there is no obstinate denial or doubt of the truth. They are no more heretics than the man who takes the property of another unwittingly is a thief." Among more recent writers on the same point, Father Joyce, S.J., has this to say: "Many baptized heretics have been educated in their erroneous beliefs. . . . They accept what they believe to be the Divine revelation. Such as these belong to the Church in desire, for they are at heart anxious to fulfil God's will in their regard. In virtue of their baptism and good will, they may be in a state of grace. They belong to the soul of the Church, though they are not united to the visible body. As such they are members of the Church internally, though not externally."

This much being premised, it may be worth while to proffer to the young members of the clergy a few considerations on the congruous attitude of the Catholic pastor toward those who are, either formally or only materially, outside the Church. Let it be remarked at the outset that the question, as it affects the average American priest, is not precisely the same as in the case of a number of his European confrères. Very many of those transatlantic priests have been born and brought up in a thoroughly Catholic atmosphere and environment. Their chums and schoolmates in boyhood, their companions in college, their friends and neighbors at home, their very acquaintances even, have been entirely at one with them in faith and hope and religious practice. Heresy in the abstract they have known as an evil affecting other lands, or

possibly other provinces of their own country; but with concrete heresy, actual heretical boys and girls and men and women, they have scarcely ever come in contact. Even as pastors, their problems regarding those residents in their parish who do not attend their church are in the main different from ours: the overwhelming number of such non-attendants are fallen-away Catholics, not Protestants by birth and training.

Conditions in this country are obviously of quite another complexion. The great majority of young American priests have known and come into immediate contact with concrete Protestantism from their earliest years. Not a few of them have sat on the same benches with Protestant boys and girls in the public schools, and all of them have probably mingled with Protestant friends and neighbors in the games and sports and parties and picnics and excursions and public celebrations and other social and business relations of co-dwellers in towns and villages and rural districts. In very few, if any, American communities is the religious atmosphere entirely, or even pre-vaillingly, Catholic; in the vast majority of them it is preponderantly non-Catholic; and in an occasional district here and there, especially in the South, it is avowedly anti-Catholic. Now, while this condition of affairs will be advocated by no one as in any sense an ideal condition for the full development of genuine Catholic life and action, it can hardly be denied that it is not absolutely devoid of some slight compensating advantages to the American priest whose boyhood, youth, and incipient manhood have been lived in subjection thereto. On the face of it, his comprehension of the point of view, the mentality, the prejudices and the ignorance (invincible or otherwise) of the average American Protestant is an asset that can easily be turned to good account in a work which every truly zealous priest should have at heart, the bringing into Christ's fold of those "other sheep" for whom as well as for ourselves the Precious Blood was shed on Calvary.

It is a truism to say that ardent zeal, the apostolic spirit, the missionary longing to spread Christ's true Gospel is, or at least should be, a characteristic of every cleric ordained to the ministry of God's altar. To the parish priest in the most Protestant town or village in the United States, not less than to the foreign missionary in Africa, India, or China, are ap-

plicable the words of St. James: "My brethren, if any of you err from the truth, and one convert him: he must know that he who causeth a sinner to be converted from the error of his way, shall save his soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins." In all probability there is no Catholic parish in this country in which may not be found more than one or two non-Catholics whom a little effort on the part of the pastor would speedily bring into the Church, who are ready even now, given the occasion, to say to the priest, as Agrippa to Paul, "In a little thou persuadest me to become a Christian"; and happy the pastor who in such a case can truthfully echo St. Paul's reply: "I would to God that, both in little and in much, not only thou but also all that hear me, this day, should become such as I also am, except these bonds." Christ's commission, "Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature," cannot be restricted in our day either to the workers in the foreign mission field, or to the preachers of missions to non-Catholics here at home: it is binding, in some degree at least, on all those who have received from Him the transcendent powers of offering Mass and forgiving sins.

That a goodly number of our American clergy recognize the reality of this obligation and consistently strive to fulfil it is made evident by the muster-roll of converts credited to many of our dioceses from year to year. Hundreds of our pastors, more especially those in our larger towns and cities, habitually have under instruction classes of non-Catholics numbering from two or three to a dozen or a score. Here and there throughout the country is found an exceptionally zealous priest whose efforts for the conversion of his separated brethren meet with almost phenomenal success, or success which seems phenomenal to other clerics who either do not have, or do not profit by, the same opportunities of increasing the number of their parishioners. Granting that conditions vary considerably in different parts of the country, that the Protestant soil is in some of our States hard and sterile while in others it is rich and fruitful; granting, too, that the aptitude to influence non-Catholics and gradually win them, first, to take a sympathetic interest in our religion, and finally to embrace it, is notably less marked in some priests than in others, it may still be questioned whether a pastor who has exercised his ministry

for ten or fifteen or twenty years without having to his credit a single convert to the faith, can flatter himself that he has done his full duty in the accomplishment of the second of the two great commandments: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Lack of opportunity and lack of natural dispositions for the work may count for something in his failure to make conversions; but it will be profitable for him to probe his inner consciousness and inquire whether another factor in the failure has not been his lack of zeal.

To insist, as such a pastor is likely to do, that the spiritual care of the Catholic flock specifically entrusted to his ministrations engrosses all his time and energy, that he has quite enough to do in looking after his own people without adding the supererogatory work of evangelizing outsiders, is to make what at first blush may appear a thoroughly common-sense statement; but on examination it will be found that while the statement contains something of truth, it holds a good deal more of fallacy. The implication that zeal in convert-making connotes any measure of neglect of a priest's proper parishioners is altogether erroneous, is so fallacious in fact that in nine cases out of ten the true connotation is the direct antithesis of that implied. Almost invariably the priest who is unusually successful in winning those "without the walls" to enter the Church is a pastor noted for his spirit of self-sacrifice and devotedness to his flock, an exemplary cleric in his habitual bearing and conduct, a never-failing friend to the poor and unfortunate, a frequent visitor to the sick and the afflicted, a wise and patient counsellor to those in difficulties, a veritable spiritual father to all those entrusted to his pastoral charge. It does not require much knowledge of human nature, indeed, to understand that these very qualities, exemplified in his daily life, furnish an intelligible explanation of his success as a convert-maker. Whether or not he takes account of the fact, the priest in every American city, town, village, or rural district is a marked man; and the fewer imperfections of any kind that are discernible in his life, the greater the assurance that some at least of his non-Catholic fellow-citizens will be impressed by the beauty of the religion which he *lives* as well as preaches.

Quite apart from any question of conversions, it is eminently worth while for a priest to give some thought to the nature of the individual influence which he exerts on the men and women in the little world around him. While it is probably true to say that if there is one petition which, less than another, the average mortal, priest or layman, need address to Heaven, it is the prayer attributed to a naive Scotch dominie: "O Lord, gie us a good conceit o' oursel's," and while it is the part of wisdom not to take oneself too seriously, not to be carried away by a sense of one's self-importance, it is neither absurd nor foolish for a priest to recognize that to the Catholic cleric with peculiar appropriateness are addressed the words of St. Matthew: "You are the light of the world. A city seated on a mountain cannot be hid." Individual example is a more potent agency for good or evil than the unreflecting are apt to consider it; and no member of a community, certainly no priest, is so insignificant that his principles and actions, his conversation and conduct do not sway toward right or wrong some few at least of his fellow-citizens. "Even the weakest natures", says Smiles, "exercise some influence upon those about them. The approximation of feeling, thought, and habit is constant, and the action of example unceasing." What most laymen, and possibly a few priests, need to have persistently impressed upon their minds, as to this matter of individual influence, is the unquestionable truth that we shall be judged with regard, not merely to the evil we have done, but also to the good which we have failed to do. Not to give a positively bad example is well enough as far as it goes, but it clearly does not constitute the complete fulfilment of a cleric's duty to the people in the world about him. A priest's influence on those with whom he comes habitually in contact, be they Catholic or Protestant, infidels or Jews, ought to be something more than simply innocuous; it should be positively, not to say aggressively, beneficent. A man of God, a true ambassador of Christ, he should impress those not of the household of the faith in much the same way as Carlyle was impressed by the life-story of the twelfth-century monk of St. Edmund's:

The great antique heart: how like a child's in its simplicity, like a man's in its earnest solemnity and depth! Heaven lies over him wheresoever he goes or stands on Earth; making all Earth a mystic

Temple to him, the Earth's business all a kind of worship. Glimpses of bright creatures flash in the common sunlight; angels yet hover doing God's messages among men: that rainbow was set in the clouds by the hand of God! Wonder, miracle encompass the man; he lives in an element of miracle; Heaven's splendor over his head, Hell's darkness under his feet. A great law of duty, high as these two infinities, dwarfing all else, annihilating all else—making royal Richard as small as peasant Samson, smaller if need be!—The "imaginative faculties"? "Rude poetic ages"? The "primeval poetic element"? O for God's sake, good reader, talk no more of all that! It was not a Dilettantism, this of Abbot Samson. It was a Reality, and it is one. The garment only of it is dead; the essence of it lives through all Time and all Eternity! ¹

In a truer sense than was dreamt of by the Scotch essayist the twentieth-century priest not less than the twelfth-century monk "lives in an element of miracle", is encompassed by supernatural wonders from morning till night—summoning God Himself from the supernal glory of Heaven to the humble altar whereon He is daily offered as a propitiatory sacrifice, visiting Jesus Christ really present in the tabernacle from time to time as the hours slip by, nay, *acting* Jesus Christ both at the altar and in the confessional—*Hoc est enim corpus meum*—*Ego te absolvo a peccatis tuis*. In very truth Heaven lies over the priest wheresoever he goes or stands on earth, is close at hand—the adorable Persons of the Blessed Trinity, the Immaculate Mother of the Word Incarnate, and all the hosts of archangels and angels and glorified saints within easy call. And surely such closeness to the supernatural, such intimate communion with the Creator, the Redeemer, and the Sanctifier of mankind and with Their heavenly worshippers of every rank should leave its impress on the privileged mortal who enjoys a blessing so signal and so constant. As a matter of fact, the impress *is* left, not merely on the mind and soul of the priest, but on his exterior form as well. That outward indication, so undefinable yet so unmistakable, of interior character or feeling or emotion to which we give the name "expression"; that significant, if indescribable, cast of countenance, peculiar look or appearance that we call "bearing" or "air" sets off the ordained priest from all other men, and, although of almost infinite variety, is so far uniform that it is recognized

¹ *Past and Present*, p. 91.

at once by the world at large, by those outside the fold as well as by our brethren in the faith. It is a truism that no masquerade is more transparent and futile than that of the priest who attempts by the disguise of costume to conceal his identity.

This inalienable and unalterable stamp of the priesthood which each of us wears necessarily affects our relations with non-Catholic neighbors, acquaintances, and fellow-citizens generally. It may well, for instance, lead us to manifest toward these separated brethren more politeness, courtesy, and affability than they could reasonably claim from us were we merely Catholic laymen. Any advances looking toward acquaintanceship or possible friendship may congruously be made from our side, if only to counterbalance the exaggerated sense of aloofness with which the average Protestant man in the street regards one of our cloth. Just what degree of approachableness, urbanity, complaisance, or affability a priest may properly display in his intercourse with non-Catholics is not of course a matter to be settled with rubrical or mathematical definiteness and precision. Quite within the bounds of gentlemanly conduct such as every cleric is professionally called upon to observe, there are widely different types of manners and modes of action advocated in theory and exemplified in practice by clerical advisers and clerics themselves, the world over. Without being really insolent, haughty, arrogant, dictatorial, supercilious, overbearing, or domineering, a priest may by his exaggerated reserve and constraint and silence, or by his undue readiness to take offence where none is intended and "to stand upon his dignity" without any genuine provocation thereto, impress non-Catholics with the idea that he really deserves these unflattering epithets; and it is needless to add that such an impression is not calculated to facilitate the accomplishment of the priest's appointed work in either the natural or the supernatural sphere.

In Scott's "*Fortunes of Nigel*" there is a passage not altogether irrelevant to this question of the affability of the clergy. Speaking of his hero, a young nobleman, he says: "He was not, as the reader may have observed, very affable in his disposition, or apt to enter into conversation with those into whose company he was casually thrown. This was, indeed, an error in his conduct, arising less from pride . . . than

from a sort of bashful reluctance to mix in the conversation of those with whom he was not familiar. It is a fault to be cured only by experience and knowledge of the world, which soon teaches every sensible and acute person the important lesson that amusement, and, what is of more consequence, that information and increase of knowledge, are to be derived from the conversation of every individual whatsoever with whom he is thrown into a natural train of communication." A writer far otherwise celebrated and authoritative than Sir Walter expounds much the same sort of philosophy when he tells us: "I became all things to all men that I might save all". Obviously, there are extremes to be avoided in affability as well as in its opposite. St. Paul's "all things to all men" is not accurately transphrased, or rendered, by our "hail-fellow-well-met"; and were the Apostle of the Gentiles living in our day, it is safe to assert that even *his* ardent longing to convert his Protestant fellow-citizens would not lead him to acquire the reputation of being "one of the boys", or to be acclaimed as "a jolly good fellow" by a convivial throng vociferously declaring: "We won't go home till morning".

In actual practice, however, even in this aggressively democratic country of ours, very few priests overstep the congruous limits of the geniality and sociability that should characterize their attitude toward their neighbors and acquaintances outside the fold; and the relatively negligible exceptions who do carry their fraternization and cordiality to extremes invariably learn by experience that their exaggerated unconventionalism, their unduly free and easy intercourse with Protestant neighbors eventually defeats any laudable purpose they may have had in view in adopting it. It is well to remember that one may have a social temperament, may be what American slang expressively terms "a good mixer" without at all compromising one's sacerdotal dignity or laying oneself open to the charge of unpriestly levity and frivolity. Between the austere-visaged cleric who uniformly "keeps himself to himself" and keeps others at a distance, who is reserved and silent and severe in looks if not in words, whose brows are wrinkled with frowns oftener than his lips are wreathed with smiles, who in a word is distinctly unsociable—between him and the flippant young curate or youthful pastor who rather affects non-Catholic com-

pany and ostentatiously puts himself on the level thereof, who is apparently at some pains to show that his priestly character is no hindrance to his participation in the most worldly of sports or conversations, who tolerates in his presence the telling of questionable anecdotes or possibly narrates a few himself, who aspires in a word to the reputation of a man of the world rather than that of a man of God—between these two extremes, we say, there is a golden mean, a happy medium that is admirable, and is in fact admired by Catholics and non-Catholics alike. No intelligent Protestant expects a priest to conform to standards that are lower than the highest, and no intelligent priest will allow human respect, the desire for applause, or the fear of ridicule to move him a hairbreadth from the line of conduct which ecclesiastical law and clerical custom have prescribed for his guidance and practice; but without coming into conflict with any law or established custom a judicious cleric may do much to serve the eternal interests of his non-Catholic neighbors and the material temporal interests of himself and his parishioners by maintaining amicable relations with such fellow-townsmen as are not of the household of the faith.

No one familiar with the ordinary conditions in an American or a Canadian village or small town in which Catholics form only a fifth or sixth, possibly but a fifteenth or sixteenth, of the population needs to be told that the honor of God and His Church and the salvation of souls are best promoted by the pastor who combines affability and tact and good-will toward all with general culture, irreproachable conduct, and enlightened zeal. Genuinely cordial relations with the Protestant lawyers, doctors, business men, and even ministers of the community need militate in no way against the most loyal adherence to Catholic principles, or tend to the slightest minimizing of Catholic doctrines. On the other hand, such relations will in a hundred and one different ways prove of unquestionable utility in safeguarding (to take only the lowest ground) the civic rights and purely temporal interests of the Catholic flock. The non-Catholic editor, for instance, who habitually meets Father Murphy on the footing of pleasant acquaintanceship or the higher plane of real friendship, will refuse to lend his columns to the propagation of anti-Catholic

appeals to local prejudice, and will hesitate about reproducing from other papers malicious attacks against the Church and her ministers generally. Friendly relations with the Protestant physicians of the town remove not a few difficulties which the pastor would otherwise encounter in his visits to the local hospital, and ensure his knowledge of some necessary sick-calls that might otherwise escape his notice. Public spirit and intelligent interests in the activities that make for the general prosperity and progress of the community lead easily enough to the priest's nomination as a member of various boards—educational, charitable, commercial, or industrial; and his election thereto is a matter of no little import to himself and his parishioners.

It has been said in the foregoing paragraph that the priest may congruously have cordial relations even with the non-Catholic ministers who are his fellow-citizens. While judicious and experienced clerics are not at all likely to question the truth of this assertion, it may be worth while for the sake of some of our immature or younger readers to fortify our position by the quotation of a couple of extracts from approved Catholic authors. In *Rules for the Pastors of Souls* we read: "As a priest, filled with lofty ideals and guided by exquisite refinement and social tact, you will certainly not deny that degree of esteem and delicate consideration for the religious sentiments of those outside the Catholic Church which you claim for yourself. It betrays a mean soul, a narrow heart, and lack of moral maturity, to have the audacity to invade the sanctuary of another's religion with a wanton spirit. Even the pagans, who manifestly are given to a false religion, justly claim this tender consideration for their religious views and feelings." Somewhat different, this, from the theory and alas! from the practice as well, of an otherwise thoroughly pious and exemplary pastor now deceased, with whom the present writer was acquainted a good many years ago. He appeared to know intuitively whenever a non-Catholic was present in his church, and on such occasions invariably made it a point, no matter what was the specific subject of his sermon, to bring in the axiom, "Outside the Church no salvation", and to explain it as meaning, purely and simply, that all Protestants would go to hell for all eternity. Needless to

say, he did considerably more harm than good by thus unwittingly misrepresenting Catholic doctrine.

The work quoted above is a translation from the German. Of greater interest and relevancy, perhaps, is the following passage from the charming little volume *Within My Parish*, the chapters of which originally appeared in this REVIEW: "My relations with the various Protestant ministers in town have been and are cordial and enduring. I have not been above learning from them in some matters of practical administration, and I like to think that my contact with them may have been conducive to the breaking-down of a few of their inherited préjudices. In our discussions we most often take our stand upon opinions or doctrines held in common, rather than upon those about which we differ. I think no greater mistake has been made by Catholic controversialists than the drawing of the invidious distinction between the Catholic religion as true and Protestantism as false. The distinction really to be observed is between the Catholic religion as true and Protestantism as partly true. There is, as you perceive, a wide difference in the methods of attack. One, I fear, has served but to alienate further from the Church many good and sincere people; the other may be rendered capable of drawing many to Her."

A useful, if not necessary, comment on the foregoing is that it behooves the pastor who cultivates cordial and friendly relation with ministers of the various sects in his city, town, or village, to see that his intellectual equipment is not allowed to deteriorate. The day of the crude, uneducated, often illiterate, Protestant preacher has practically passed away; and the Episcopalian, Presbyterian, Baptist, or Congregationalist minister who is our neighbor and our possible friend may well be a thoroughly cultured, university-bred, versatile, widely-read, all-round scholar. It is accordingly incumbent on the priest who comes in contact with him, either in private or semi-public discussions, to have at his finger-tips, not only the old-time arguments in favor of the Church, but the correct answers to the latest sophistical contentions of rationalism, pseudo-science, Christian Science, New Thought, etc., etc. His reading must be up to date. While his familiarity with the handbook commonly proffered to prospective converts may

be taken for granted, he has not always perhaps at hand such useful books as *Catholic Flowers from Protestant Gardens*, *Tributes of Protestant Writers*, *Outside the Walls*, and similar collections of non-Catholic encomiums on Catholic doctrine, devotion, or practice. Most men who have had any experience in polemics are aware that a not ineffective controversial weapon is the authority of one of our opponent's recognized leaders aptly and tellingly quoted against the position taken by our opponent himself. Apart from their utility as auxiliaries in argumentation, such books, loaned or given to non-Catholic friends, can scarcely fail to weaken prejudice, lessen intolerance, and stimulate the Protestant mind to salutary cogitation.

There is one other consideration worth while emphasizing in connexion with the priest's attitude toward those of his friends, acquaintances, and fellow-townsmen who do not belong to the visible body of the Church: he can pray for them, pray habitually and fervently. In Leo XIII's Encyclical, *Sapientiae Christianae*, we read: "In the duties that join us to God and to the Church, the greatest thing to be noted is that in the propagation of Christian truth every one of us should labor as far as lies in his power". Now, irrespective of the validity or the ineptitude of the grounds on which a given pastor may seek to justify his failure to treat non-Catholics with the kindness and affability advocated in this chapter, he can assuredly give no plausible reason for neglecting this charitable duty of prayer for those outside the fold. In his daily visit to the Blessed Sacrament, or in the privacy of his oratory at night prayer, he may fittingly voice the petition which the Church herself solemnly chants on Good Friday: "Let us also pray for heretics and schismatics: that our Lord and God would deliver them from all their errors, and vouchsafe to call them back to our holy Mother, the Catholic and Apostolic Church. . . . Almighty and everlasting God, who savest all men, and desirest not that any should perish: look down on such souls as are deceived by the wiles of the devil; that, laying aside all heretical perverseness, the hearts of those who are in error may be converted, and may return to the unity of Thy truth." This much at least, fervent and frequent prayer, would seem to be the minimum of apostolic effort

congruous to the priest living among those "other sheep" whom Christ longs so ardently to see gathered into His own fold; but thrice happy the really zealous pastor who supplements fervent prayer by effective works, who treats his Protestant neighbors as friends whom he hopes to see become one day his spiritual children: he is taking long steps toward the eventual fulfilment of his hope, the realization of his priestly purpose in a glorious harvest of souls.

ARTHUR BARRY O'NEILL, C.S.C.

Notre Dame, Indiana.

HONORING AMERICA'S SAINT.

THE Americas have produced so few saints that they can ill afford to let pass unnoticed an anniversary which recalls in a most puissant way the condescensions of God's love on this Western Hemisphere. It is safe to say that every saint vouchsafed a people is not only a tangible manifestation of His love but also a veritable gift from His hand. For the saints of God, even those who live the most hidden and obscure lives, exercise a powerful influence for good, not only upon their own times but upon all subsequent ages, inasmuch as they draw by the cords of Adam those men of good-will whose hearts are open to the solicitation of all that is noble, pure, and holy. By their prayers and mortifications the saints draw down from heaven, like a fresh dew, God's mercy on their contemporaries, whilst by the odor of their virtues they induce men to run in the way of righteousness. They do not so much preach, as actually draw, for, after all, few men are carried along by abstract truths and principles. It is probably for this reason that the Scriptures are so eminently practical and so easily applied. And for the same reason we find of surpassing interest those pages of the Church's history which tell the life-story of men and women who reduced to practice the Gospel teachings.

It is generally admitted that Americans are not given overmuch to speculation and philosophy. They are essentially a practical people, and as such they are irresistibly drawn one way or another by the example of men who have achieved success in the work which they have outlined for themselves.

Now, success of a spiritual kind should prove the most powerful of all magnets, because deep down in the heart of every man there is a native fund of nobility which cannot long remain indifferent to the appeal of a life spent in God's service.

We can easily understand, then, why the life-story of St. Rose of Lima should exercise a mighty influence over the lives of Americans, since she was not only one of God's chosen ones, but the first flower of sanctity to blossom in this far-off corner of the Master's garden. Our interest in her is deepened by the knowledge that as far back as 1671 Pope Clement X, in canonizing her, appointed her the special protectress of North and South America and the Philippine Islands, at the same time remarking: "St. Rose seems to have been raised up by Almighty God for the conversion of the Americas." And we may take it for granted that when the Sovereign Pontiff assigns a given saint to any people as its special patron, it is because of the salutary lessons which that servant of God can teach that people. And just as the Pope at that far-off day, by a most remarkable prevision, associated the Philippines with America, so he laid his finger unerringly upon the dominating weakness of our people. When he appointed St. Rose patroness of the entire Western Hemisphere he intended to set her up as the very antithesis of our national flaws of character. What, then, are the outstanding characteristics of St. Rose's life, and in what way can she, better than any other saint, teach us the lessons we most need to learn?

First of all, St. Rose was an ardent disciple of the Crucified Master. From her earliest years she embraced the Cross gladly, seeing in it her salvation. It would be making a fatal mistake, however, to infer that by nature she was coarse or harsh, and consequently predisposed, so to say, to a penitential life. On the contrary, if there is one thing that stands out clearly in her life it is her exquisite delicacy and refinement. The mere sight of suffering or disorder caused her actual physical pain. We know that it was only at the cost of heroic effort that she forced herself to submit to the penitential regime which she had outlined for herself. Her spirit, doubtless, often rebelled against the incredible austerities which she practised. It was only by the grace of God and her own iron will that she was able to master herself completely and con-

tinue on the way of the cross. In this love of mortification, self-immolation, self-crucifixion, she is a striking example to this Western world, where more than elsewhere the cult of ease and luxury obtains. If she can teach our age and people anything at all, it is the old Gospel truth, that only by suffering—self-imposed on the one hand, willingly accepted from God, on the other—can we hope to rise superior to ourselves.

Her love of obscurity was of such a nature that it caused her actual pain when men singled her out for honors or praise. Her oldest biographer, with the *naïveté* which characterized the chroniclers of those days, remarked that the only occasion upon which the infant had been known to cry was when she was carried by her proud mother to the home of a neighbor for admiration. She joined the Third Order of St. Dominic so that she might, as it were, lose her identity and pre-eminence in that large Chapter of Tertiaries which then wended its way to the Church of San Domingo for spiritual guidance. Like St. Paul, by all save the Master she wished to be reputed as nothing. Persistently and consistently she tried during her entire life to hang the curtain of obscurity around her good deeds and her spiritual experience, so that men might not look upon her as the favorite child of Heaven. And an age, like our own, that is eaten up by the desire to be heralded abroad, sorely needs to be reminded that the true worth of a man consists, not in what people say about him, but in what God thinks of him. The blatant publicity which is everywhere used as a stepping-stone to success and preëminence is shown up at its true worth by the example of St. Rose, who understood fully that the honors and privileges and fame for which men so madly strive are but the veriest baubles.

A third characteristic of St. Rose's life was her obedience, not only to her parents in the home but to her ghostly father. There may be those, indeed, who will smile superiorly at the conduct of this holy virgin, who in order to win the full reward of obedience would not perform the smallest routine duties of her daily life without the express leave of her superiors. To all save those deeply versed in the spiritual life the docility with which she obeyed the slightest direction of her confessor may seem like an exaggerated scrupulosity. But the psychologist will recognize in the discipline which was the

result of her willing obedience one of the most powerful factors in the formation of her strong character. And if there is one place in the world to-day where the teaching of the utilities of obedience is sorely needed, it is precisely in our own country, where, owing to the freedom of speech and action allowed, men have laid themselves open to the danger of making liberty synonymous with license. We can never hope to rear a generation of obedient men unless we can make them see that, far from being servile, submission to lawful authority is one of the most potent forces in the building up of a genuine, four-square character.

Now, it was three hundred years ago that Pope Clement X held up St. Rose for the admiration and imitation of this Western world as a glorious model of those three virtues which her age conspicuously lacked. And as at the present day we stand sorely in need of precisely those same virtues, nothing can be of greater spiritual profit than to become familiar with them, as exemplified in her life. It is probably for this reason that our Holy Father, Pope Benedict XV, has granted a plenary indulgence to all American Catholics who during the third centennial year of St. Rose's death—or, to be more precise, up to 30 August, 1918—make a triduum in her honor. For each day of the triduum an additional indulgence of three hundred days is granted. By extending to the United States a privilege which was privately granted 13 February, 1917, to the inhabitants of St. Rose's native city only, the Holy Father is trying his best to bring American Catholics to the feet of their own special patroness, there to learn lessons of abiding worth. It is evidently the intention of the Pope that during this her centennial year our first American saint shall be honored in a most special way.

The generous grant of these precious indulgences by the Pope forms a fitting accompaniment to the Crusade of Grace which was started some months ago in commemoration of the third secular anniversary of St. Rose's death. With the full approbation of the American hierarchy the Crusade of Grace seeks to enlist all those Americans who, trusting in the powerful intercession of their patron saint, strive through her to obtain spiritual and temporal blessings for their country. And not only do the Crusaders pray for the protection

of our land during these trying and searching times, but, realizing the value of the true Faith, they implore God to deepen and strengthen it in our midst. All kinds of good works may be offered up for the intentions of the Crusade—prayers, Masses, Communion, alms, etc.; and members are asked to send a complete list of them to *The Rosary Magazine*, 871 Lexington Avenue, New York City, so that at the end of the centennial year, on the feast-day of St. Rose, the names of all participating in the Crusade, together with their spiritual offerings, may be laid on the tomb of the saint, where Mass will be offered up for them.

Although the Crusade has been in operation for only three months, no fewer than thirty million spiritual offerings have so far been tabulated. Most of the bishops of the country have gone out of their way to commend the Crusade to their priests, seeing in it a unique movement in the history of the American Church, inasmuch as there is absolutely no financial consideration to be taken into account. Keen observers from Europe who have visited our shores have remarked that American Catholics seem to identify Catholicism with financial generosity, thus laying themselves open to the danger of belittling and slighting spiritual values. As the Crusade of Grace insists always and everywhere on the use of spiritual arms only, it has merited commendation both at home and abroad as one of the most significant and momentous spiritual movements of the times. In its own way it seconds the wish of our Holy Father, Benedict XV, who as a remedy for the sick times through which we are passing, implores the faithful throughout the world to pray to God for the restoration of peace. If Senator Borah, in his speech delivered before the United States Senate on 26 July, 1917, performed a patriotic duty when he bade all Americans pray as they had never prayed before in their history, then surely the Crusade of Grace is performing its own part in the great work of social reconstruction which has already begun. By bringing into men's view once more the example of a noble, God-fearing woman who rose superior to all the weaknesses of humanity, and by teaching men the necessity of storming heaven by prayer, the Crusade merits the coöperation of every one who has at heart the good of his country and his Faith.

Many bishops of the country have signified their willingness not only to spread the Crusade of Grace in their respective dioceses, but also to order the celebration of a special novena in honor of St. Rose some time during the centennial year in every church over which they have jurisdiction. These wise and far-seeing prelates recognize the fact that while all the saints of God are deeply interested in the Church, the saints assigned as protectors of certain countries are especially wrapped up in the temporal and spiritual prosperity of the people intrusted to their care. Who can say that the millions of prayers constantly ascending to heaven from the ranks of the great army of Crusaders may not bring about the speedy and happy termination of the great world-war?

THOMAS M. SCHWERTNER, O.P.

New York City.

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE NEW CODE OF CANON LAW.

THE feature of the new Code that appeals at once to the student is that there are consecutive numbers for the short canons or paragraphs from the first to the last page of the volume. This arrangement of the subject matter makes it an easy book of reference. Equally pleasing is the systematic grouping of the main topics of law into five books, namely, General Norms and Principles, Ecclesiastical Persons, the Sacraments and whatever is connected with them, Canonical Trials including the Processes of Beatification, Ecclesiastical Censures and Penalties.

In the present article I shall confine myself to a study of the most important points of the first book of the Code. This section comprises six titles, namely, Ecclesiastical Law (Tit. I), Customs (Tit. II), Reckoning of Time (Tit. III), Rescripts (Tit. IV), Privileges (Tit. V), Dispensations (Tit. VI).

I. ECCLESIASTICAL LAW IN GENERAL.

The Code plainly states that the laws contained therein are obligatory only for Catholics of the Latin Rite, except in those points which of their very nature affect also the Oriental Church. This ruling is not new; it has obtained for many

centuries. On account of the great diversity in manners and customs between the peoples of the East and those of Europe and other countries Christianized by missionaries of the Latin Rite, the Holy See does not wish to make them subject to the same laws as the Catholics of the Latin Rite. The laws on questions of faith and morals, however, of their very nature bind all Catholics in union with the See of St. Peter.

All liturgical laws heretofore published retain their force, except those that are explicitly corrected in the Code (Can. 2).

Special agreements or concordats made between certain nations and the Holy See are not changed by the new Code.

Acquired rights and privileges and indults which have been granted by the Holy See to individuals or organizations, if they are still in use and have not been revoked, remain in force unless they are explicitly revoked in the Code (Can. 4).

Customs both particular and universal at present in existence are abolished only where the Code expressly says so. Centenary and immemorial customs may be tolerated if the bishop judges that they cannot prudently be abolished. If, however, the Code expressly condemns such customs, they can no longer lawfully be retained (Can. 5).

As regards laws published before the Code comes into force, the general rule is that all former laws, whether particular (for instance, for a certain country, Religious Order, etc.), or universal, which *conflict* with the laws of the Code, are hereby abolished, unless the Code explicitly rules otherwise in respect of any special law.

Canons of the Code which repeat former laws exactly as they were before, must be interpreted by the authority of the old law and the approved and accepted commentaries of canonists. Canons which agree only in part with the former law must be interpreted like the former law in those points in which they agree with the old law; in the points in which the new law differs from the former regulations they must be judged by their wording and context. When it is doubtful whether a law of the new Code differs from the old law, one must not deviate from the former law.

All former ecclesiastical punishments, whether spiritual or temporal, medicinal or vindictive, *latae or ferendae sententiae*, of which the Code makes no mention, are held to be abolished.

All other disciplinary laws which have been in force up to the present time cease to be binding, unless they are explicitly or implicitly found in the new Code. The laws found in approval liturgical books, however, remain in force (Can. 6).

These first six canons are of great importance for the solution of the serious questions about laws, both universal and particular, in force prior to the date on which the new Code becomes obligatory. The Code, it will be noticed, annuls all previous laws, whether for the universal Church or for particular churches and organizations, which are *opposed* to the laws of the new Code, unless allowance is explicitly made in the Code for particular laws on certain points. Thus, for instance, the Code allows particular regulations in regard to holidays of obligation and for fast and abstinence days to remain in force, though these are at variance with the rules of the Code.

Question may arise about particular laws issued by authorities subordinate to the Holy See, for example, those of the Councils of Baltimore. Are they abolished? If they are opposed to the laws of the Code, they are certainly annulled, unless the Code expressly sanctions them.

Particular laws that are not in opposition to the laws of the Code present a difficulty. Number 6 of Canon 6 states that all the other disciplinary laws which have heretofore been in force lose binding power unless they are contained either explicitly or implicitly in the new Code. Does this ruling apply to the universal laws of the Church? Or does it apply to both particular and universal laws? It is not likely that the Code intends to abolish diocesan laws or those of national or provincial councils when they are not in opposition to the new Code. This Canon is made clearer by Canon 22, from which it appears quite certain that such particular laws are not annulled.

Canon 9 states that papal laws will be promulgated by the official organ of the Holy See, the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, unless special promulgation is ordered, and that these laws will begin to be obligatory three months from the date of the issue of the magazine containing the law. After this space of time, therefore, none of the clergy can claim ignorance of the law. Knowledge of the law is presumed from that time, and

anyone who pleads ignorance must bring proof that it was impossible for him to have gained knowledge of the law in question.

Laws are considered to be territorial and not to bind outside the territory for which they are passed unless the law indicates that they are personal also (Can. 8). The general laws of the Church bind all the faithful for whom they were passed in any part of the world. Particular laws for a country or a diocese bind, as a rule, only so long as one stays in the country or diocese in question. Those who are on a journey or who stay for a while in a given place, without having there a domicile or quasi-domicile, those, namely, who are known in law as *peregrini*, are not bound by the special laws of their own diocese or country, unless the transgression committed outside their own territory injures someone in their own diocese, or unless the laws transgressed are not only territorial but also personal. *Peregrini* are furthermore free from the observance of the particular laws of the diocese in which they are sojourning, except in those laws that are made for public order or that have to do with the formalities of contracts and other transactions. Dispensations from the common laws of the Church given to dioceses or countries may be enjoyed by travellers in such places. Those who have no domicile or quasi-domicile anywhere, that is, *vagi*, are bound to observe both the common law and the particular law in the countries and dioceses in which they happen to be (Can. 14).

The laws, even those that annul an action or inabilitate a person to perform certain acts validly, do not bind when there is a *dubium juris*, that is to say, a doubt arising from the law itself. *In dubio facti*, that is to say when there is a doubt as to the fact on which the law is based, for instance, when after due investigation it remains doubtful whether certain persons are really blood relations, the Code rules that the bishop has the right to dispense in all cases in which the Roman Pontiff ordinarily grants dispensations.

Ignorance of laws which annul an action or inabilitate a person to act does not excuse from these laws, unless the Code expressly allows ignorance as an excuse. Ignorance or error concerning laws or penalties, or the excuse of ignorance of one's own actions or the notorious action of another, is not as

a rule presumed by the law. But where there is question of another's action that is not notorious, ignorance is presumed until the contrary is proved (Can. 16).

A more recent law issued by competent authority abolishes a former law if this is expressly stated, or if the new law is directly contrary to the old, or if the new law makes over the entire matter of the old law. Apart from particular laws that are opposed to the new Code, the general law by no means revokes the statutes of particular places and for particular persons, unless this is explicitly done by the new Code (Can. 22).

Whenever it is doubtful whether a former law has been revoked, revocation is not to be presumed. The old laws should rather be reconciled with the new, as far as possible. It is an ancient and well established principle of Canon Law that the correction of laws is considered odious, and therefore existing laws are to be considered amended or abolished only when the new law is incompatible with the old one or the legislator indicates his intention to abrogate the old law.

Precepts given to individuals oblige those to whom they are given, but they cannot be urged in a canonical trial and they lose their binding force with the passing out of office of the one who made them. If, however, they are given either by a document in legal form or before witnesses, these precepts can be urged in the ecclesiastical court and do not expire with the loss of office of the one who imposed them. (Can. 24.)

II. CUSTOMS.

In order that a custom may have the force of law, it must have the sanction of the competent ecclesiastical superiors (Can. 25). Only those communities, dioceses, religious orders, etc., that are capable of receiving laws, can introduce customs which have the force of law. Communities, therefore, which are governed by laws, diocesan, provincial, etc., are capable of introducing law by custom. No custom can abrogate or modify the divine law, either natural or positive. In order that a contrary custom may have the power to change Church laws, it must be (1) reasonable, and (2) lawfully prescribed by the usage of full forty successive years. Against a law of the Church which contains a clause forbidding contrary customs for the future, only a reasonable custom of a

hundred years' standing or more can attain the force of law. A custom which is explicitly forbidden in law is not considered reasonable (Can. 27).

Customs *praeter jus*, that is to say, such as are not against a law, but outside it, and which have been knowingly introduced by a community with the intention of binding its members, become law if they are reasonable and lawfully prescribed by usage of forty continuous and complete years (Can. 28).

A new law contrary to an established custom *ipso facto* revokes that custom, that is, a general law revokes general customs, a particular law revokes contrary customs in the diocese or district for which the law was enacted. A general law, however, does not *ipso facto* revoke a lawful custom of particular countries or dioceses, for the new Code upholds the old rule that "*generi per speciem derogatur*", that is, the general law is modified by the particular law. Likewise, customs of a hundred years' standing or from time immemorial are not *ipso facto* revoked by a contrary law, but only when such customs are explicitly forbidden.

There was no precise text of law before the present Code to determine the number of years required for a custom to become law. While the Decretals gave legal consent to customs that were reasonable and lawfully prescribed, they did not specify the length of time needed for such prescription. Wherefore canonists were divided on this point and even Pope Benedict in his *Synodus Dioecessana* states that the older canonists generally demanded a space of forty years, while many of the more recent authors thought ten years sufficient. Pope Benedict thought their opinion not improbable. The new Code gives a uniform rule for customs *contra* as well as *praeter legem*.

III. MANNER OF RECKONING TIME.

Apart from the liturgical laws, time is to be reckoned according to the following rules, unless the canon explicitly makes an exception.

1. A day consist of twenty-four hours, to be counted from midnight to midnight; and a week consists of seven days.

2. A month in law means a period of thirty days; a year, 365 days, unless the month and year are said to be taken according to the calendar (Can. 32).

In reckoning the hours of the day the common custom of the place is to be observed, but in the private celebration of Holy Mass, in the private recitation of the Divine Office, in receiving Holy Communion, and in the observance of the law of fast and abstinence, one may follow also the local true time or the mean time, or the legal or any other of the several ways of marking the time for midnight and midday. Naturally, midday and midnight fall a little earlier or later as one goes East or West. For business purposes the local natural or true time is not very practical, wherefore so-called Standard time is followed in the United States, by which we have four zones, or Eastern, Central, Mountain, and Pacific Standard time, each making a difference of one hour or a total difference of three hours between Eastern and Pacific time. The difference between the Standard time and the local true time varies with the location of the towns and cities in the respective zones. Thus it may be twelve o'clock midnight by Standard time while according to the local true time it is twenty minutes or a quarter to twelve. The Code sanctions the following of such difference—for instance, in the fast, the recitation of the Divine Office, etc.

The time for determining the obligation arising from contracts is to be reckoned according to the rules of the civil law of each country, unless a special agreement has been made on this point.

If the month or the year is designated in law by its proper name or its equivalent, for example, "the month of February", "the following year", they are taken as in the calendar.

If the terminus *a quo* is neither implicitly nor explicitly assigned, for instance, suspension from the celebration of Holy Mass for a month or for a year, or three months' vacation in a year, and the like, the time is to be calculated from moment to moment, and if, as in the first example, the time is continuous, the month and year are taken as in the calendar; if the period of time is intermittent, a week means seven days, a month thirty days, and a year three hundred and sixty-five days.

If the time consists of one or several months or years, one or several weeks, or several days, and the terminus *a quo* is explicitly or implicitly fixed, the following rules obtain: 1. the month and year are taken as in the calendar; 2. if the terminus *a quo* coincides with the beginning of the day, for example, two months of vacation from the fifteenth of August, the first day shall be counted in the number of days and the time expires with the *beginning* of the last day of the same number; 3. if the terminus *a quo* does not coincide with the beginning of the day, for instance, the fourteenth year of age, the year of novitiate, eight days from the vacancy of a bishopric, ten days for appeal, etc., the first day shall not be counted and the time expires when the last day of the same number is *ended*; 4. if the month should not have the same number of days, for example, one month from the thirtieth of January, the time expires either with the beginning or the end of the last day of the month, as the case may be; 5. if there be question of actions of the same kind to be repeated at stated intervals, for instance, a three-year term from the taking of temporary vows to the taking of perpetual vows, three or more years between elections, etc., the time expires on the same day of the month on which the period began; but the new action may take place any time during the day. The fact, therefore, that a profession took place early in the morning or late in the day does not oblige one to wait for the same hour for the renewal of vows. The same holds in case of elections, etc.

The term *tempus utile* means that the time for the exercise or prosecution of one's rights does not elapse if one is ignorant of the rights or cannot act at the time. The term *tempus continuum* in law means a space of time that does not suffer any suspension by reason of one's ignorance or impossibility to act.

IV. RESCRIPTS.

The general principles concerning rescripts by which dispensations and various other favors are granted by the Holy See are summed up under this title of the Code. I shall direct attention to the more important regulations that are either in part or entirely new.

Canon 43 states that, should one of the Roman Congregations or Offices refuse a favor asked of them, the same favor cannot be asked of and granted by any other of the Sacred Congregations, or even by one's own bishop who may have delegated faculties, unless the Sacred Congregation of which the favor was first asked gives its consent.

The granting of a favor that was first asked of and refused by the vicar general and then obtained from the bishop, without mentioning that application had first been made to the vicar general and refused, is *invalid*. A favor that has been refused by the bishop cannot validly be granted by the vicar general, even though the petitioner tells him of the bishop's refusal.

Rescripts are no longer considered invalid on account of an error in the name of the person to whom or by whom the favor is granted, or a mistake in the place of residence, or a mistake concerning the subject of concession, so long as, in the prudent judgment of the bishop, there is no doubt concerning the person and the matter of the favor.

Rescripts which are granted directly to the petitioner (*in forma gratiosa*), without intermediary, must be shown to the bishop only when it is so stated in the rescript itself, or when there is question of public affairs, or when the bishop has a right to pass upon the conditions requisite for the favor—for instance, in the case of the privilege of having Holy Mass said in a private house where canon law leaves it to the bishop to judge whether the place is suitable for the purpose.

By a contrary law favors granted through a rescript are not revoked, unless it is otherwise stated in the law, or unless the law was made by the superior of the grantor.

Vacancy of the Holy See or of a bishopric does not invalidate rescripts given by the deceased pontiff or bishop, unless the terms of the rescript state otherwise, or unless the rescript names a delegate to grant the favor to the individual mentioned and the delegate has not yet begun to exercise his powers. As soon as the rescript has been presented to the individual so delegated the case is opened and he can act even though the pope or bishop granting the favor has retired from office.

V. PRIVILEGES.

Privileges can be acquired through direct concession by the competent authority, by communication of privileges, and also by legitimate custom and prescription. Canon 613 states that communication of privileges between religious orders is revoked, and that each order shall have only what is conceded by the Code, or the favors that have been directly granted it by the Holy See.

Faculties that are given habitually or *in perpetuum*, or for a certain length of time, or a certain number of cases, are counted among the privileges *praeter jus*. This consideration allows a liberal explanation of such faculties; whereas, if they were to be considered *contra jus*, their interpretation would have to be strict.

Only by a general law can the privileges contained in this Code be revoked. Privileges do not become void by the death or loss of office of the grantor, unless they are granted with the clause *ad beneplacitum nostrum*, or an equivalent phrase.

VI. DISPENSATIONS.

A dispensation is a relaxation of the law in special cases. From the common law of the Church none can dispense except the Holy See, or someone delegated by the Holy See. Without special faculties the bishop can dispense only when recourse to the Holy See is difficult and the case is urgent and of such a nature that the Holy See would dispense.

The bishop and other ordinaries of dioceses, vicariates apostolic, etc., can dispense from diocesan laws, and laws of provincial and national councils; but they cannot dispense from laws published by the Holy See for particular countries or dioceses.

Pastors may for reasonable cause dispense individuals from the obligation of the fast and abstinence and from the law forbidding servile work on Sundays and holidays of obligation.

FR. STANISLAUS WOYWOD, O.F.M.

Paterson, New Jersey.

LUTHER'S FAITH AND REASON.

SINCE the year, 1883, when the Protestant world celebrated the fourth centenary of Martin Luther's birth at Eisleben, scholars who have made a special study of the religious revolt of the sixteenth century have accepted as an undeniable historical conclusion the existence of two Luthers—a Luther of fiction and a Luther of fact. As posterity and historical scholarship have done justice to Luther, by drawing a sharp line of demarcation between the ideal reformer of panegyric and romance and the real founder of Protestantism, so also have theologians, after a thorough and searching study of the spirit and principles underlying the Reformation, discovered that Lutheranism, far from being an unmixed blessing, contained the germs of Evangelicalism and Liberalism, and of that Rationalism which underlies all the aberrations of modern Philosophy and runs through all the developments of the Higher Criticism, until finally it has run to seed in Modernism—that strange *conlectum omnium heresion*, as Pius X well styled it, which in our own day has succeeded in destroying the very vitals of Protestantism, whose philosophical and theological foundations the sapping of intellect had long since undermined, because of its revolt against their inconsistencies and logical contradictions.

It is a strange paradox indeed that the religious revolt of the sixteenth century, which set out ostensibly to vindicate the independence of intellect, and to free it from the yoke of all authority, should be declared to be responsible for all the religious indifference of to-day, and even to have contained in germ those philosophical systems which are loudest in their charge of incompetency against the conclusions of reason, and in their denial of any validity to intellectual knowledge, ever since the day that Immanuel Kant became the founder of modern philosophical criticism. And yet this is only what might have been expected from the very beginning. It is the principle of private judgment driven to its logical conclusions. Since all truth has one source, it is not possible to divorce reason from religion; to set up a false religion and then to look to reason to justify such a course, cannot but end disastrously for the new theology, whose conclusions at every turn must be established

at the expense of logical consistency. So that the logical course for the reformers, and the one which history shows them to have adopted, since they were too proud to acknowledge their apostacy and go back to the bosom of the true Church, was to set up a perplexing and exasperating antinomy between faith and reason; to say that the former had no foundation in the latter, nay, that the dogmas of the one contradicted the conclusions of the other. There was one way by which a *rapprochement* could be effected between erroneous religious principles and intellectual integrity, and Protestant theologians have adopted it, when they deny any intellectual basis whatsoever for their doctrines, and make emotionalism alone the bar before which they are forever summoning the religious instinct to justify itself; knowing that before the bar of right reason, their system stands condemned.

There are those who would make modern philosophy responsible for the ruin of faith in intellectual circles among the contradictory sects into which Protestantism is dissolving from day to day. But perhaps a truer conception of Reformation theology would go to show that modern philosophical systems themselves are rather a result than a cause of the errors that make religion to-day outside the Catholic Church anything but an *obsequium rationabile*. The most prominent characteristic of modern philosophy is a doubting scepticism stamped indelibly upon its beginning by its founder, René Descartes. The intellectual movement that culminated in the Reformation theology, and developed into Reformation philosophy, began long before October of 1517. It takes its origin, not from Luther, or the Castle Church of Wittenberg, but from the Humanists who came forth from Constantinople after its fall in 1453. Of course the movement received a great impetus from the Reformation, whose proud boast was the overthrow of all authority in matters of religious belief, and the enthronement in its stead of the supremacy of individual thought. The systems of Descartes' successors differed not so much in kind as in degree.

Immanuel Kant is probably the greatest thinker of modern philosophy. He is certainly the one of whom it is proudest; and yet his greatest contribution to philosophical thought is nothing but a grand act of despair in the capabilities of the

human intellect, amounting in fact to a denial of the objective validity of knowledge. Though setting out, like many another reformer, with the best of intentions, it was the author of the *Critique of Pure Reason* who put the finishing touches to Cartesian doubt and Cartesian rationalism. Modern thought in its origin and development is thus sceptical and agnostic, and Immanuel Kant is its prophet; for he was the one great thinker that has left the deepest impress upon the writers that followed him. He was, in the words of Sabatier, the master mind that makes leaders of lesser calibre proud to boast of the fact that they have received their philosophic initiation and baptism from his *Critique*.

When we speak then of modern thought, we mean systems of philosophy that are preponderantly rationalistic, and, when there is question of the supernatural, altogether agnostic. This is to say that modern thought is dominated and impregnated, colored and tainted, by the philosophy of Kant. Even the philosophical principles underlying the religious sentimentality of Schleiermacher presuppose the *Critique of Practical Reason* of the professor of Königsberg.

Our age is one of sceptical unbelief in every department of knowledge. Rules of human conduct are vicious because they are founded on false principles of destructive philosophies. Leo XIII, looking at the dangers that threatened modern society, civil and religious, saw the root of the evil in the pestilence of perverse opinions built on the shifting foundations of weak and shallow philosophy, and declared that all society would be much more tranquil and much safer if healthier teaching were given in universities and schools. "If anyone will look carefully at the bitterness of our times, and if he considers earnestly the cause of what is done in public and in private life, he will discover with certainty the prolific root of the evils which are now overwhelming us and which we greatly fear. He will find that the cause lies in the evil teaching about things human and divine that has come forth from the schools of philosophers. It has crept into all the orders of the state, and it has been received with the common applause of very many."¹ Were Leo living to-day, how true and how

¹ Encyclical Letter on the Restoration of Christian Philosophy.

justified he would think his diagnosis of the maladies that are slowly disrupting the social fabric.

It remained for Leo's successor, Pius X, to proscribe in no uncertain terms the attempts that were being made to readjust Christianity to the mentality of the age, and to reinterpret its dogmas in terms of modern thought. As Newman aptly expressed it, "while believing revelation, there is a tendency to fuse and recast it, to tune it, as it were, to a different key, and to reset its harmonies."

The Catholic Church, because it is divine, and the pillar and ground of infallible truth, has come forth triumphant from the open and covert attacks of these insidious and erroneous teachings; but alas, what has become, for those outside its fold, of those doctrines of faith and morality once held sacred even by the reformers themselves! In the absence of any infallible authority in their churches, the influence of modern philosophy has captivated the minds of Protestant theologians, and with them religion has ceased to connote all that it has hitherto stood for in the minds of reasonable men. Not only supernatural religion, but even our natural knowledge of God and the consequences that spring from that knowledge, with regard to His rights and our duties toward Him, has been corrupted and destroyed. We search in vain among the writings of modern philosophers to find a place in their theories of knowledge for the God of Scholasticism. The name is mentioned, indeed, but the orthodox signification is conspicuous by its absence. "The adherents of these various systems like to be called Monists, and they are wont to apply the name of God to their one reality, into which they profess to resolve all existence; but the true name for them is *Atheists*, and we must protest against the practice of giving to the Name of God a meaning distinct from that which it has hitherto borne, and even opposite to it, in all that gives to the idea of God its special value as the basis of moral conduct and obligation."² For if God does not exist, religion and morality are mere meaningless abstractions.

Kant's influence then is clearly discernible in the groundwork of modern thought. It is rationalistic, because Kant was a rationalist. It denies the supernatural and poses as agnostic,

² Boedder, *Natural Theology*, p. 209.

because Kant was pleased to put the supernatural outside the pale of intellectual knowledge. Because Kant in his Lutheranistic pietism made religion a matter of personal inward experience independent of external authority, modern thought, impatient of the restraints of any control, appeals to the supreme tribunal of the inner consciousness as the sacred fountain whence emanates the pure stream of religion and morality undefiled. The human heart has thus become the Sinai whence is promulgated the new decalogue of sentimental liberalism.

It is easy to show that modern philosophy is proximately responsible for the decay of religious teaching in matters of faith and morals, for so Popes and Councils have taught us. But is it possible to prove that modern thought is itself an excrescence of Reformation theology, that darkens our understanding and weakens our will, and leaves in us a strong inclination to flippancy and shallowness when treating of the most sacred truths? Is this a result of the original sin of Martin Luther, what time he nailed his ninety-five theses to the doors of the Castle Church of Wittenberg, on that fateful eve of all Saints, 1517, when the novel doctrines of the Saxon monk put him at the head of that religious unrest which his ready comprehension had shown him to be swaying the contemporary world, as expressed in the unsettled currents of thought then prevalent in its intellectual centres?

The theology of present-day Protestantism, as championed by men like Dr. McConnell, calls for a complete divorce of religion from objective fact and grounds of intellect, and a founding of the whole edifice upon an emotional consciousness. It has no express intention of turning atheist any more than Kant had; but, like him, it is satisfied with the undogmatic and emotional piety inspired by Luther. Since even God Himself cannot be reached by intellect, and human nature cannot well get on without Him, we must believe in God for reasons of expediency and sentimentalism. Since modern philosophy knows no science of metaphysics, its psychology will not allow the modern theologian to say that God exists, a proposition that savors too much of the medieval science of being. Its *credo in unum Deum* is revised and modernized and brought abreast of the age into "*Man cannot help wishing a God to be.*" If to the subjectivism of Kant be added the humanism of

Professor James, we have the foundations upon which is built the whole *summa* of Protestant theology, deducible with mathematical exactness from its *primum verum*—"Wanted, a God". Each man's religion is just what he finds it expedient to believe. Man needs religion and creates it for himself accordingly. If it suits his interests to believe in it, it is so far forth good and true. But other men may think otherwise, and so are free to believe otherwise also. Since even the expedient for the same individual is subject to change, so proportionately his beliefs and their object may change too. What was good and true yesterday may be bad and false tomorrow. Thus does dogma progress and regress; and truth, becoming identified with expediency of belief and a vague undefinable sentimentality, the will and emotions, not intellect, are made its judges.

Emotional standards are especially the deciding factor in matters of supernatural beliefs; and the only test of experience to which it is legitimate to subject them is—How do they serve the account of the individual who in the security of his foggy and mystified pietism scorns to formulate any system of objective apologetics? Each must decide for himself, his religion, its foundations, origin, and genesis, in the introverted quiet of the sanctuary of his own soul, if he has a soul; and every age is supreme in deciding what are its own peculiar religious needs, and this conglomeration of individual tastes, in a given time, is the universal consciousness, to whose bidding the Church must conform its teachings and its practices, its dogmas and its morals, if it is to remain true to this Christian consciousness. That is the Court of final appeal and last resort for enlightened humanity, emancipated from the yoke of every authority, human and divine. Even the bondage of knowing the truth is forsaken for the freedom of doubt and denial and the inalienable liberty of wandering along the primrose paths of error, out of the beaten way that would make the mind conform itself to fixed and immovable standards of objective realities, in tending to the great goal of truth. Things are good and true because they are expedient, not expedient because they are true and good. This is Kantian subjectivism with a vengeance, for even Professor James owes much to the *Kritik der praktischen Vernunft*.

Scholasticism on the contrary would prove the truth of Christianity and all it stands for, by purely objective criteria. Religion, if you like, is a fact of human consciousness. It is a mere phenomenon of the human mind, if you only mean that men have thought about it, and have been elevated and purified for the thought of it. But if you go on to say that, because men have thought of it, and believed in it, and have lived it, they are its creators and its causes, you are assuming what, in the interest of historical and scientific truth, all sensible men must reject, namely, that our own dreaming and theorizing Egos are the creators of nature and the universe, and—pardon me for the blasphemy—the creators likewise of the God of nature and the divine authors of the supernatural itself.

The preconceived philosophical dogmas of Neo-Kantian philosophy will not allow the modern Protestant theologian intellectually to recognize things as they are in themselves, apart from the forms and impressions and creations of the human mind. His dogmatic bias makes him the measure of religious truth also, instead of making religious truth a God-given standard to which the human mind in its beliefs must conform itself. Even the great pagan Plato, more than two thousand years ago, taught "that God should be to us the measure of all things, much more than any man." Religious sentiment and emotion, then, gives us divine realities that do not exist in themselves independently of the person who believes in them. The Deity is not external but immanent in man. We cannot raise our minds and hearts to God any more in the old sense. But we can do better, think our modern Aquinases—we can raise God in our hearts and minds! Revelation and dogma are the products of the vague indefinite cravings of human desires, not objective truths that satisfy the intellect and the heart, that conform themselves to them, but things which are summoned into existence or out of it, by the passing longings of human sentiment and emotions. If God has any objectivity or permanence apart from the modern Protestant theologian's notion of Him, He has it because these ravings about religious values lie latent in the tranquil subconsciousness of the prospective believer. God is capable of being evolved at any moment, provided the aspirations of humanity are allowed to develop to their highest and their best.

How these theologians, some holding high ministerial office, in Protestant communions, can call themselves Theists and even Christians, while holding doctrines so contrary to every notion of orthodox religion, natural or revealed, passes ordinary comprehension. We are astonished to find men holding the rank of Dr. McConnell, asking in the pages of the *North American Review*, "if there is any way by which the religious man and the intelligent man, or rather the religion and the intelligence in man, can get together". And he solves his difficulty by allowing one and the same individual mind to maintain its intellectual integrity with regard to the essentials of a religion, such as we have described it, and at the same time consistently to profess faith in the venerable creeds of Christianity! Would it not be a more honest position to admit outright that the impetus of the grand and glorious Reformation of the sixteenth century has fizzled out in philosophical infidelity in the twentieth? And now that the Protestant Churches are doing special honor this year to the founder of Protestantism, is it not strange that reflecting minds among them cannot see that it is Luther who is responsible for all this travesty of unreasoned religion, this eviscerated Christianity of modern times? All this liberal theology of to-day is only a revival of Lutheranism, because it was his Lutheranistic pietism that made Kant seek God through the practical reason, after he had dethroned him from his seat in the intellect proper.

Liberalism, in following Kant, is thus unconsciously imitating the example set by Luther. As long ago as 1852 the keen mind of Newman saw that it was Luther who had sown the seeds of the terrible religious indifference and widespread unbelief which exists in the modern world, and which has gone on increasing to such an alarming extent to our own day, under the baneful influence of egregious systems of idealistic philosophy. The following passage from the pen of the illustrious Cardinal, in the *Idea of a University*, fully substantiates our thesis. "In proportion as the Lutheran leaven spread, it became fashionable to say that faith was, not an acceptance of revealed doctrine, not an act of the intellect, but a feeling, an emotion, an affection, an appetency; and, as this view of faith obtained, so was the connexion of Faith with Truth and Knowledge more and more either forgotten or denied. At

length the identity of this (so-called) spirituality of heart and the virtue of Faith was acknowledged on all hands. Some men indeed disapproved the pietism in question, others admired it; but whether they admired or disapproved, both the one party and the other found themselves in agreement on the main point, viz. in considering that this really was in substance Religion, and nothing else; that Religion was based, not on argument, but on taste and sentiment, that nothing was objective, everything subjective in doctrine. . . . They learned to believe and to take it for granted, that Religion was nothing beyond a *supply* of the wants of human nature, not an external fact and a work of God. There was, it appeared, a demand for religion, and therefore there was a supply; human nature could not do without religion, any more than it could do without bread; a supply was absolutely necessary, good or bad, and, as in the case of the articles of daily sustenance, an article which was really inferior was better than none at all. Thus religion was useful, venerable, beautiful, the sanction of order, the stay of government, the curb of self-will and self-indulgence, which the laws cannot reach: but, after all, on what was it based? Why, that was a question delicate to ask, and imprudent to answer; but, if the truth must be spoken, however reluctantly, the long and short of the matter was this, that Religion was based on custom, on prejudice, on law, on education, on habit, on loyalty, on feudalism, on enlightened experience, on many, many things, but not at all on reason; reason was neither its warrant, nor its instrument, and science had as little connexion with it as with the fashions of the seasons, or the state of the weather."

Over against this travesty of theology stands the rock-ribbed system of the Catholic Church, which, sinning neither by excess nor defect, holds that "the doctrine of our Saviour is indeed perfect in itself and has need of nothing, for as much as it is the power and the wisdom of God." Yet does it not despise the native dignity of the human intellect, but believes "that a rightly and wisely used system of philosophy is able in a certain measure to pave and to guard the road to the true faith, and is able also to prepare the minds of its followers in a fitting way for the receiving of revelation." It knows full well that Greek philosophy does not make the faith more power-

ful, but still it knows that great and glorious truths can be gathered from human reason. It teaches that the philosophy of the schools "is an education leading to the Christian faith," "a prelude and help to Christianity," "a schoolmaster for the gospel." Not confining speculation within the limits of the narrow circle of a mere theory of knowing, it does not make its metaphysics conterminous with psychology, even that caricature of a psychology that ignores or denies the existence of an immortal soul. With a true scientific imagination, it will not divorce knowledge from experience; it scorns to abandon for the mere poetic monistic idealism of the Neo-Kantians its well balanced science of being, built on that sane and moderate dualism borrowed of Aristotle, which, while it exalts mind infinitely above matter, still has room for a real distinction between intellect and the world which it cognizes, and, being rationally theistic, between God and His creation.

The higher unity of pantheism never charmed the true Scholastic. He made indeed the being of the contingent world analogous to the being of God, but infinitely below it. The scholastic mind was ever bent on the bed-rock of being, not wasting its energies on mere forms of thought; but, accepting facts, it made a pronounced objectivity the most characteristic feature of its whole system of philosophy. It accepted as an axiomatic truth the invincible belief that man sees a world which is no part of his own mind, nor yet a necessary shadow cast by the Creator outside His own infinity. This primary dictum of the philosophy of the Schools kept metaphysics and psychology distinct, a distinction altogether ignored by modern idealism, which confounds consciousness with all reality, making it the object, not the instrument, of its cognition; and thus it ends in a vulgar pantheism. Thus Scholasticism is able to establish triumphantly against all the specious arguments of sophistry the *praeambula fidei*—the immortality of the human soul, the existence of God. It shows that God excels in His own peculiar excellence, by the sum of all perfections, by an infinite wisdom from which nothing is hidden, and by a supreme justice, which no shadow of evil can touch. It proves that God is not only true, but the truth itself, incapable of deceiving or being deceived; and thus does

human reason obtain for the word of God the fullest belief and authority.

Thus does this twin alliance of faith and reason, effected in the councils of Scholasticism, reject a separate peace with the foes of truth. Theology was partly divine and partly human. It is divine inasmuch as it came from heaven in revealed truths or principles which human reason developed as it proceeded from premise to conclusion, establishing beforehand, by its own unaided powers, the trustworthiness of the sources of knowledge whence came those truths that lay outside its own special sphere of inquiry, namely: those dogmas that belong exclusively to the higher science of theology, those mysteries of our holy faith which the human mind can neither demonstrate nor comprehend.

Distinct though the two sciences of philosophy and theology are in their formal objects, still are their conclusions ever in complete harmony, because since both spring from the same fountain of knowledge, it is essentially impossible for the God of nature and the supernatural ever to contradict Himself. Faith never contradicts reason, because it does not at all follow that because a mystery is incomprehensible to human reason, it must therefore be labeled a contradiction. Revelation enlarges the horizon of knowledge, and, accepting the limitations of human thought to lie within the bounds of the natural order of things, faith strengthens and supplements and becomes a complement of reason. Beyond the confines where human knowledge terminates, modern agnostic philosophy places the region of nescience, where no human thing can dwell; while the Scholastic, with the light of faith upon his soul and the word of God for a lamp to his feet, enters a new world, a land of promise made known by a higher knowledge revealed by God, to which assent is reasonably given, since the authority of its source has already been demonstrated—the authority of the infallible Godhead. Knowledge, for the Scholastic, is co-extensive with reality. As reality is the twofold realm of science and faith, the latter continuous with the former, assent to its dogmas is still radically reasonable; for belief must rest ultimately on the authority of God, and it is the unaided light of human reason which primarily must tell us that God cannot deceive or be deceived.

If our faith then is not to degenerate into a blind superstition, reason must furnish unaided the motives of credibility and establish beyond prudent doubt the preambles of supernatural faith. Scholasticism, unlike later systems of philosophy, then, does not seek refuge in any insoluble enigmas, any irreconcilable antinomies between faith and reason, but recognizes that revelation is eminently reasonable, and that reason is in a manner divine. This is the greatest triumph of the philosophy of the Schools, this constructive synthesis that clearly defines the provinces of philosophy and theology, while it shows perfect harmony between faith and science, between the human reason and the divine. Catholicity is the true champion of the claims of intellect, for even God Himself or His Church does not ask us to accept the truths of faith blindly, but, as a preliminary thereto, He wishes us to make full use of our reason. All He demands of us is that we trust those to whom He has given the requisite credentials.

Scholastic theology at all times has consequently insisted on the necessity of objective apologetics, and Catholics are the most rational of believers, because they will not rest their beliefs on merely subjective feelings, but only on the rock of objective and infallible criteria. Even the most profound mysteries of the faith, though anything but objectively evident, are not accepted until they have become evidently credible, by the application of standards of assent which are themselves objectively evident in their certainty, which is the ultimate criterion of certitude.

Liberal Protestantism on the contrary rejects reason for the sake of the religious sense. Their faith is only a blind groping after the unknowable that cannot be scientifically justified by reason, according to their own premises. For Catholics, as Pascal truly remarked, "faith is the highest act of reason," and the Vatican Council itself teaches us that right reason demonstrates the foundations of faith. "If any person says that divine revelation cannot become credible by external signs, and that by internal experience alone or by private inspiration men are moved to faith, let him be anathema."³

³ Can. 3, De Fid. Cath.

Relative immanence has its place in Catholic theology, we admit, and some modern Catholic apologists lay great stress on internal feelings and desires; but it is questionable whether this method is practical in scientific apologetics. Hence Catholic theologians are extremely cautious about the emphasis placed on these methods as against the traditional and recognized proofs. As motives of belief they must not receive undue prominence, especially if this is done at the expense of keeping external motives in the background. Without borrowing from Protestant apologetics, subjective states of mind cannot receive too much value in a scientific analysis of the motives of credibility. These should be at all times severely tested in the light of objective facts. It was fear of the light that cannot injure the truth which made Luther take refuge in subjectivism. Kant's subjective idealism, when applied to religion, we have seen develop into pantheism in the hands of Fichte, Schelling, and Hegel; while Schleiermacher did not hesitate to make a mere subjective sentiment the very essence of religion, and the great and penetrating, but unscholastically trained, mind of Newman himself, while still a Protestant, thought it sound criticism to teach that popular feeling and moral instinct was sufficient ground for the reformers of the sixteenth century, in giving their assent to the belief that the Bible was truly the word of God. Psychological voluntarism and credulity may lead into any extravagance in religious states, apart from the restraint of constitutional checks and balances administered under the dry light and before the cold scientific cross-examination of the bar of intellect.

It must not be inferred from our thesis, however, that the assent of supernatural faith is no stronger than the natural motives of credibility warrant. For an act of supernatural faith there is need of divine grace to enlighten the understanding and strengthen the will. We are not dealing explicitly, however, with the act of faith in itself, so much as with the reasons that make the faith that is in us a reasonable service. Our quarrel is with liberal Protestantism, which after it broke with authority went on to ridicule the supernatural, and, calling itself rational, rejected the reasonable credentials demanded of orthodox Christianity; the while appealing to reason, and still inconsistently presuming to pass judgment on

revelation and the supernatural and declaring unknowable everything that transcends the limits of reason, and gratuitously confining the limits of reason itself to knowledge of the phenomena of sensible things only.

The Catholic on the contrary examines the documents of his faith, and tests the value of the motives of his belief. Accepting the primary conceptions of the understanding which are known immediately by the light of reason, such as first principles, he is certain he can acquire the knowledge of God. His reason, too, can establish God's holiness and veracity, and consequently the grounds for the reasonableness of faith in divine revelation, which is ultimately based on the infallible authority of God. This mode of procedure is eminently reasonable, and thus Catholicism is the real apotheosis of intellect; and Protestantism, while boastfully asserting the contrary, stands convicted in principle and in theory of being avowedly hostile to the independent rights of reason, preferring in the name of a false liberty, which is in reality license, the degrading freedom of being in error to the glorious bondage of knowing the truth.

J. C. HARRINGTON.

St. Paul, Minnesota.



Analecta.

ACTA BENEDICTI PP. XV.

I.

COMMISSIO INSTITUITUR AD CODICIS CANONES AUTHENTICE
INTERPRETANDOS.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

Cum iuris canonici Codicem, fel. rec. decessoris Nostri Pii X iussu digestum, non multo ante, expectationem totius catholici orbis explentes, promulgaverimus, Ecclesiae bonum ipsiusque natura rei profecto postulant ut, quantum fieri potest, caveamus, ne aut incertis privatorum hominum de germano canonum sensu opinionibus et coniecturis, aut crebra novarum legum varietate, tanti operis stabilitas in discrimen aliquando vocetur. Quapropter propositum Nobis est utrique incommodo occurrere; quod ut efficiamus, Motu proprio, certa scientia atque matura deliberatione Nostra, haec quae infra scripta sunt statuimus atque decernimus:

I. Exemplum decessorum Nostrorum secuti, qui decretorum Concilii Tridentini interpretationem proprio Patrum Cardinalium coetui commiserunt, Consilium seu *Commissionem*, uti vocant, constituimus, cui uni ius erit Codicis canones authentice interpretandi, audita tamen, in rebus maioris momenti, Sacra ea Congregatione cuius propria res sit, quae Consilio disceptanda proponitur. Idem vero Consilium constare

volumus ex aliquot S. R. E. Cardinalibus, quorum unus coetui praesit, Auctoritate Nostra et successorum Nostrorum deligendis; his accedent tum vir probatus, qui sacri Consilii erit ab Actis, tum aliquot Consultores ex utroque clero iuris canonici periti, eadem Auctoritate designandi; sed Consilio ius erit Consultores quoque Sacrarum Congregationum, pro sua quemque re, sententiam rogandi.

II. Sacrae Romanae Congregationes *nova Decreta Generalia* iamnunc ne ferant, nisi qua gravis Ecclesiae universae necessitas aliud suadeat. Ordinarium igitur earum munus in hoc genere erit tum curare ut Codicis praescripta religiose serventur, tum *Instructiones*, si res ferat, edere, quae iisdem Codicis praeceptis maiorem et lucem afferant et efficientiam pariant. Eiusmodi vero documenta sic conficiantur, ut non modo sint, sed appareant etiam quasi quaedam explanationes et complementa canonum, qui idcirco in documentorum contextu peropportune afferentur.

III. Si quando, decursu temporum, Ecclesiae universae bonum postulabit, ut novum generale decretum ab aliqua Sacra Congregatione condatur, ea ipsa decretum conficiat, quod si a Codicis praescriptis dissentiat, Summum Pontificem de eiusmodi discrepantia moneat. Decretum autem, a Pontifice approbatum, eadem Sacra Congregatio ad Consilium deferat, cuius erit, ad Decreti sententiam, canonem vel canones redigere. Si decretum e praescripto Codicis discrepet, Consilium indicet cuinam Codicis legi nova lex sufficiens sit; si in decreto res vertetur de qua Codex sileat, Consilium constituat quo loco novus canon vel novi canones sint in Codicem inserendi, numero canonis, qui proxime antecedit, *bis, ter*, etc. repetito, ne canon sede sua moveatur ullus aut numerorum series quoquo pacto perturbetur. Quae omnia, statim post Sacrae Congregationis Decretum, in *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* referantur.

Quae Nobis videmur utiliter in hac causa decrevisse, ea omnia et singula, uti decreta sunt, ita rata et firma esse et manere volumus ac iubemus: contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum, die xv mensis septembris anno MCMXVII, Pontificatus Nostri quarto.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

II.

OPPIDUM BRENTWOOD IN EPISCOPALEM CIVITATEM ERIGITUR
ET IN EO SEDES EPISCOPALIS CONSTITUITUR NOVAE DIO-
ECESIS IN ANGLIA NUPER ERECTAE.

BENEDICTUS EPISCOPUS

Servus Servorum Dei

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Universalis Ecclesiae procuratio, Romanis Pontificibus credita, illos admovet ut novas in orbe catholico dioeceses constituat, quum id ad maiorem dominici gregis utilitatem cedere videatur.

Cum igitur ad incrementum religionis et ad maius animarum bonum opportunum et necessarium visum sit ut latissima Westmonasteriensis archidioecesis, in Anglia, in duas partes divideretur novaque et distincta dioecesis efformaretur, Nos, de consensu dilecti filii Nostri Francisci tituli S. Pudentianae S. R. E. Cardinalis Bourne, hodierni archiepiscopi Westmonasteriensis, suppleto insuper, quatenus opus fuisset, aliorum, quorum interest vel sua interesse praesumeret, consensu, ex consulto quoque Venerabilium Fratrum Nostrorum S. R. E. Cardinalium S. Congregationis Consistorialis Patrum, Comitatum seu Provinciam civilem, cui nomen *Essex*, a dioecesi Westmonasteriensi distraximus atque divisimus et in propriam ac distinctam dioecesim constituimus et suffraganeam Metropolitanae Ecclesiae Westmonasteriensi statuimus ac decrevimus.

Imminente autem Consistorio diei vigesimae secundae mensis martii currentis anni Domini millesimi nongentesimi decimi septimi, ne res infecta diu remaneret et beneficium differretur, Nos in novae dioecesis Administratorem Apostolicum, usque dum de nova sede et Cathedrali Ecclesia deligenda aliisque determinandis opportuna consilia susciperentur, dilectum filium Bernardum Ward, collata eidem in memorato Consistorio Episcopali dignitate una cum titulari Ecclesia Lyddensi, deputavimus.

In praesenti vero cum iidem Archiepiscopus Westmonasteriensis et Administrator Apostolicus censuerint optimum con-

silium esse, sedem episcopalem novae dioecesis in civitate *Brentwood* collocare, Cathedralem Ecclesiam in ea constituere, ab eaque nomen novae dioecesis indicare, Nos, omnibus mature perpensis, de Apostolicae potestatis plenitudine, memoratum oppidum *Brentwood* in civitatem episcopalem erigimus et in eo sedem episcopalem constituimus, cum omnibus iuribus et privilegiis quibus ceterae sedes Episcopales in Anglia gaudent.

Quod vero attinet ad novae dioecesis regimen et administrationem, ad novi Episcopi eiusque in Episcopatu successorum potestatem, auctoritatem, attributiones, officia, iura ac munia, item ad clericorum et fidelium iura ac onera, aliaque huiusmodi, servanda iubemus, quae Sacri Canones et praecipue Tridentinum Concilium statuunt ac praescribunt: sartis tectis ceteris declarationibus deinceps a S. Sede editis servatisque de iure servandis, sicut in ceteris omnibus Angliae dioecesibus.

Fines insuper novae Brentwoodensis dioecesis eos volumus et decernimus esse, quos nunc habet Comitatus civilis, seu Provincia, cui nomen *Essex*.

Ad novam denique Cathedralem Ecclesiam Brentwoodensem eundem Venerabilem Fratrem Bernardum Ward transferimus eique in Episcopum praeficimus et pastorem ipsumque proinde a vinculo, quo titulari Ecclesiae Episcopali Lyddensi tenetur, absolvimus.

Quae autem hisce Litteris, Apostolica auctoritate, a Nobis decreta sunt, nulli hominum, ullo unquam tempore, infringere aut iis repugnare vel quomodolibet contraire liceat. Si quis, quod Deus avertat, hoc attentare praesumpserit, sciat obnoxium se evasurum esse poenis a sacris canonibus contra obsistentes exercitio ecclesiasticae iurisdictionis statutis. Ad haec autem exequenda deputamus eundem Cardinalem Archiepiscopum Westmonasteriensem, eidem necessaria huic negotio facultates tribuimus, etiam subdelegandi alium virum, in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutum, ac definitive sententiam dicendi de quavis occurrente difficultate, vel oppositione, imposito onere Romam ad Sacram Congregationem Consistorialem infra sex menses, fidem, authentica forma exaratam, absolutae executionis huius mandati transmittendi. Decernimus denique has praesentes litteras valituras contrariis quibuslibet, etiam peculiari et expressa mentione dignis, minime obstantibus.

Datum Romae apud sanctum Petrum, anno Domini MCMXVII,
die XX mensis iulii, Pontificatus Nostri anno tertio.

Loco * Plumbi.

O. CARD. CAGIANO DE AZEVEDO,
S. R. E. Cancellarius.

✱ C. CARD. DE LAI, Ep. Sabinen.,
S. C. Consistorialis Secretarius.

III.

CONCEDITUR UT ORDINIS PRAEDICATORUM FRATRES, SORORES
ET TERTIARIi IN COMMUNI VIVENTES ACCIPERE POSSINT
ABSOLUTIONEM GENERALEM CUM INDULGENTIA PLENARIA
DIE FESTO B. M. V. A. ROSARIO, ADDITA FACULTATE ABSO-
LUTIONEM HUIC FESTO ALIISQUE ADNEXAM ACCIPIENDI
INTRA OCTIDUUM.

BENEDICTUS PP. XV.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.—Supplices ad Nos preces ad-
hibuit dilectus filius Procurator Generalis Ordinis Fratrum
Praedicatorum, vota depromens Capituli Generalis Friburgi in
Helvetia mense augusto superioris anni celebrato, ut de Aposto-
lica benignitate festus dies Sanctissimi Rosarii B. Mariae
Virginis inter illos adnumerari possit, quibus Fratres Sorores-
que nec non Tertiarii in communitate viventes Ordinis ipsius,
absolutionem generalem cum indulgentia plenaria recipere
possunt. Nos votis his piis annuentes, audito dilecto filio Nos-
tro S. R. E. Cardinali Maiore Poenitentiario, de omnipotentis
Dei misericordia ac BB. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum Eius auc-
toritate confisi, concedimus et largimur, ut in universo Ordine
Praedicatorum, ubique terrarum, festus dies SSmi Rosarii
B. Mariae Virginis quotannis inter illos dies recenseatur quibus
Fratribus Sororibusque nec non Tertiariis in convictu degenti-
bus Ordinis illius fas est absolutionem generalem cum plenaria
indulgentia recipere. Ad haec largimur, ut praedicta absolutio
eique adnexa indulgentia, tum pro festo Rosarii, tum pro aliis
dicti Ordinis festis concessa, in aliam intra octavam diem trans-
ferri licite queat si forte aliquod impedimentum obsit quominus
propria die habeatur. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscum-
que. Praesentibus perpetuis futuris temporibus valituris.
Volumus autem ut praesentium Litterarum transumptis seu

exemplis, etiam impressis, manu alicuius Notarii publici subscriptis ac sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum, sub annulo Piscatoris, die XI iunii MCMXVII, Pontificatus Nostri anno tertio.

P. CARD. GASPARRI, *a Secretis Status*.

SUPREMA SAORA CONGREGATIO S. OFFICII.

DECRETUM.

CONCEDITUR INDULGENTIA CCC DIERUM RECITANTIBUS
IACULATORIAM PRECEM AD B. M. V. "A FIDUCIA".

Sanctissimus D. N. D. Benedictus div. Prov. Pp. XV, die 3 ianuarii 1917, ad preces moderatorum et alumnorum pontificii seminarii maioris Lateranensis, in cuius minori sacello imago B. V. Deiparae, a Fiducia nuncupata, praecipuo cultu honoratur, universis christifidelibus, qui, corde saltem contrito, eandem beatissimam Virginem his verbis: *Mater mea, fiducia mea!* devote invocaverint, quoties id egerint, indulgentiam trecentorum dierum, animabus quoque igne piaculari detentis profuturam, benigne concedere dignatus est. Quam Indulgentiam in perpetuum valituram esse, absque ulla Brevis expeditione, clementer indulsit. Contrariis quibuscumque non obstantibus. Documentum huius concessionis ad Supremam hanc Congregationem S. Officii, iuxta *Motu proprio* eiusdem SS. D. N., d. die 16 septembris 1915, rite exhibitum fuit, die 27 ianuarii, anno 1917.

R. CARD. MERRY DEL VAL, *Secretarius*.

L. * S.

Carolus Perosi, *Ads. S. O.*

Studies and Conferences.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

ACTS OF POPE BENEDICT XV: (1) A Commission on the interpretation of the new Code of Canon Law is appointed; (2) the town of Brentwood is made the episcopal seat of the new diocese of Essex, recently erected as a suffragan see of Westminster, England; (3) Dominican Brothers and Sisters and Tertiaries living in community may receive general absolution with plenary indulgence on the feast of Our Lady of the Rosary or within the octave of the same.

CONGREGATION OF HOLY OFFICE grants an indulgence of one hundred days for the recitation of an ejaculation to Our Lady: "Mater mea, fiducia mea."

THE PRIEST'S INTENTION AT MASS.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

In his excellent article on "The Priest's Intention at Mass" in the September number the Rev. D. Barry gives the following advice regarding the disposal of doubtfully consecrated (secondary) matter. "Well, the priest cannot in any circumstances distribute it to the people, of course. And there are two practical methods open to him. One is to put the particles in question in the tabernacle and to consecrate them or have them consecrated conditionally in the next Mass celebrated on the same altar. And another plan, which is recommended by Saint Alphonsus, is not to reserve them at all, but to consume them after the chalice . . ." (p. 244).

Evidently there may be occasions when it would be most inconvenient to adopt this advice, e. g., where there is only one priest in the church and there are many wishing to go to Holy Communion, say, on the First Friday of the month. But is this the only course open to the priest in such a predicament? I am speaking throughout this note of doubtfully consecrated (secondary) matter only. Why not consecrate the particles or ciborium in question *sub conditione* in the same Mass before the priest's Communion, whether before or after the con-

secration of the chalice? I know well what will be the immediate answer to such a question: that the new consecration is unlawful, because it is an inchoate and mutilated sacrifice. Lehmkuhl (Casus, II, 130) says of a similar case: "Cum enim in nostro casu formula maior pro sacerdotis communione rite consecrata esset, nova consecratio novum sacrificium inchoasset—quod facere est illicitum."

I have never been able to understand why Lehmkuhl, usually so clear and well founded in his decisions, should maintain that this new conditional consecration is unlawful, especially as the Rubrics of the Missal, "De defectibus in celebratione missarum occurrentibus", give four instances in which the priest is directed to begin what he calls an inchoate and mutilated sacrifice. As the matter is so practical and the course suggested will often save grave inconvenience and sometimes offence, I trust you will give me leave to quote from the Rubrics the passages bearing on this question, which require little or no comment.

Title "De defectu panis," III, 7, says: "Si hostia consecrata dispareat, vel casu aliquo, ut vento aut miraculo, vel ab aliquo animali accepta, et nequeat reperiri: tunc *altera consecretur* . . ." Evidently such an accident may happen after the consecration of the chalice. The Rubric would not direct the priest to do what is unlawful, if the new consecration were a mutilated sacrifice: the second (conditional) consecration is by a necessary connexion part and parcel of the first consecration. Under the title "De defectibus in ministerio ipso occurrentibus", X, 6, 7, 13, the following directions occur: "Si aliquid venenosum ceciderit in calicem, vel quod provocaret vomitum, vinum consecratum reponendum est in alia calice et *aliud vinum cum aqua apponendum denuo consecrandum* . . ." "Si aliquid venenatum contigerit Hostiam consecratam, tunc *alteram consecret* . . ." "Si vero nihil omnino remansit [when the consecrated chalice has been upset], ponit vinum et aquam *et consecret* . . ."

Such clear directions require no comment: they all presuppose that the new consecration is not an inchoate and mutilated sacrifice, and therefore not unlawful. Objection may be taken, of course, on the ground that in these instances there is question only of the primary matter of the sacrifice, and

my suggestion applies only to the secondary matter. The new consecration in these instances is required, not for the essence of the sacrifice—this consists in the twofold consecration which has already taken place—but only for the complement of the sacrifice, that is, the priest's Communion under both kinds. Whether there is a parity between the two cases—the priest's Communion and the peoples' Communion—I leave it to your Reverend readers to decide. I submit, therefore, that when there is a real doubt as to the consecration of the secondary matter of the sacrifice, it is quite lawful to consecrate the particles in question *in the same Mass sub conditione*. This will remove much anxiety from a scrupulous conscience and will obviate grave inconvenience and sometimes offence which would arise by leaving the doubtfully consecrated particles to be consecrated in another Mass.

EDWARD R. JAMES.

Brynmaur, England.

CATHOLIC JOURNALISM IN ITALY.

For the past twenty years the growth of Catholic journalism in every country, in both the New and the Old World, has been remarkable. In Italy this progress has been particularly evident, mainly because attacks of the anti-religious (it calls itself "anti-clerical": the word serves as a mask) camp have rendered imperative the combined labor of the priest and the zealous layman in the editorial room.

With success and enthusiasm the clergy of this country labors in the field of Catholic journalism, some regarding it as a fixed part of their lifework, others, after the manner of a hobby. No matter in what light the individuals look upon it, their journalistic activity is productive of excellent results. One of the chief proofs of this is seen in the change of tone in matters religious, which those who scan the "anti-clerical" press may discern.

No more useful hobby, probably, can the priest of Italy or of any other country cultivate. Many years ago an exceptionally able prelate, addressing a large body of seminarians on the best way of employing their spare time on the mission, recommended each of them to have a hobby. He had gone

through the mill himself in all its grades—assistant priest, parish priest, professor of theology, auxiliary-bishop, bishop, finally archbishop and metropolitan. From all points of view the aged giant, giant in mind and in body, was eminently fitted to talk to young clerics about the mission. A man of broad common sense, His Grace had the gift of humor, was an author in history and theology, had written some fiery poems on his native land as a young priest, was so keen a sportsman that when three-score and ten he loved yet to stalk over hill and dale with his dog and gun, and to sail his yacht alone on the Atlantic billows.

So he strongly insisted upon each priest having a hobby. Be it music, astronomy, or field sports, or reading or writing—no matter what it should be, let the young priest have one at hand for the time left to him after his duties are done and his professional studies attended to. Happy, said the aged prelate, is the priest who has one of these hobbies.

One of them is writing. If the priest who has a useful hobby is happy, thrice happy is he who cherishes that of the pen. What are the results of the priestly pen rightly used? First, consolation in lonely hours; secondly, edification to his readers; thirdly, honor to the diocese to which he pertains; fourthly, glory to the cause of Catholic literature.

With the exception of priests engaged in missionary work of cities and large towns, the cleric has, ordinarily speaking, a certain amount of time on his hands. In what more consoling manner can this be employed than in writing a column for the local newspaper, or a magazine article, or, if the priest be a master in Israel, in adding another chapter to his latest book? If pecuniary remuneration results from the work, well and good. If not, his pen has at least added another bit of merit to the pile already lying inside the Golden Gate, a pile that Simon Barjona will not fail to point out to him some fine day when this sturdy Galilean bids him welcome to the company of the chosen twelve.

And then the people of the parish! They are proud to see Father Tom's composition in the paper, or to point out his touch in case his name is not signed, and to compare this with what he said "last Sunday". If Father John of the neighboring parish had written a similar paragraph in much better style, its

beauty, when compared by them with what "their own" may write, would scarcely share the fate of the flower that wastes its sweetness on the desert air. For in all this wide world none can compare with what "their own priest" puts in print. Thank God, it is still one of these incongruities of life that, differ how pastor and people may on a thousand points, the latter always keep the warmest corner of their hearts for "their own priest".

Is it true that it can be strongly doubted that ecclesiastics give as much thought as they might to the importance of Catholic publications, whether as a hobby to while away usefully a spare hour or as a means of religious propaganda? If it is, it is because the power of the press is not sufficiently realized, though not through lack of zeal, for that cannot be predicated of the clergy anywhere.

Anyhow, the number of clerics who give time to journalism in some form or other has vastly increased of late years. Some conduct ecclesiastical reviews; some diocesan organs; and few there are who do not contribute a column or an article from time to time after the manner of *dilettanti*.

Let me give here a list of the examples of journalistic enterprise which we have to-day in Italy, or rather a portion of the list—for, to write it down, much more to collect the material for it, would be too big a task. The first on the list is one who fully intended giving much of his time and energy to the Catholic press and was prevented from doing so only by a more imperious call. I refer to the young Giacomo della Chiesa, who in his twenty-first year won the laurels of a lawyer in Genoa and then came to Rome to study for the priesthood in the Capranican College, "the cradle of Cardinals". In a letter dated 13 November, 1875, to a college fellow of his in Genoa, Pietro Ansaldo, who had graduated in law along with him, the young levite wrote: "I confess to you [they must have been intimate friends: the pronoun is in the second person singular] that, if God did not call me for some years yet to the retirement of works of piety in community life and to theological studies, I would consecrate all my leisure time to the Catholic press. Don't lose courage in face of difficulties. Where would the Church be if the Apostles were counted on leaving the Cenacle?" Assuredly, a great journalist was lost when we

see how firmly and sagaciously the hand that penned this letter now holds the helm of the bark of Peter?

But if Catholic journalism in Italy lost Pope Benedict XV, the law of compensation made up for it in two able disciples who took pen in hand about the same year. These were two young Neapolitan priests, Don Giuseppe Pignatelli di Belmonte and Don Giuseppe Aversa, the former of whom, the scion of a princely and wealthy house, purchased *La Libertà Cattolica* of Naples and worked on it for a number of years with Don Aversa on his staff as writer on the politics of the day. During the time in which their connexion with this paper lasted, both priests achieved excellent results in Italy's most populous city. Unfortunately one of them passed away last April in the person of the Most Rev. Giuseppe Aversa, Titular Archbishop of Sardi and Nuncio Apostolic of Munich, after serving in the Pontifical Diplomatic Service of Vienna, Cuba, and Brazil. His remains were laid in the crypt of the Cathedral of "the German Rome," amid expressions of regret on the part of the King and Queen of Bavaria, the Government and nobility of Munich, all of whom attended the funeral obsequies.

The other is His Eminence Cardinal Granito di Belmonte, Bishop of the suburban diocese of Albano, one of the Cardinals *in Curia*, who, though now precluded by his duties in the Sacred College from wielding the pen, does not fail to take a deep interest in Catholic journalism.

There is another member of the Senate of the Church who, until quite recently, was one of the grand phalanx of knights of the pen, so recently, indeed, that he left the editorial chair straight for a seat in the College of Cardinals. This is Cardinal Niccolo Marini, of the "Title" of S. Maria in Domnica. Under the auspices of Pope Leo XIII Cardinal Marini founded *Il Bessarione* in 1896, a periodical published by him in Rome in the interests of the reunion of the churches of the Orient and the Occident. This publication has done much for the cause so close to the heart of the Vicar of Christ. Only by accident did I come to learn some months ago that the principal reason which Pope Benedict XV had for elevating Monsignor Marini to the dignity of the Roman purple was the fact of his having founded *Il Bessarione* and done so much through it for the recall of straying sheep in the East to the

Western fold. On inquiring at the Papal Secretariate of State if there were any truth in the report of the Pope's intention to appoint a cardinalitial commission for the reopening of the question relating to the validity of Anglican Orders, the Deputy Secretary of State assured me of the great weight *Il Bessarione* had with the Holy Father in raising its editor to the dignity of cardinal.

Another foundation of Monsignor Marini's is *Il Crisostomo*, a periodical devoted to the subject of sacred eloquence for the use of the clergy of Italy. And still another publication stands to his credit, viz. *La Donna Italiana*. His Eminence is now rounding out his seventy-fourth year, and he insists as firmly as he did forty years ago on the power of the Fourth Estate.

Than Cardinal Pietro Maffi, Archbishop of Pisa, Italy does not hold within her confines a more strenuous propagandist for the diffusion of a sound press. One of the most influential cardinals in the recent and in the present pontificate, he has even urged his priests and people to push forward the safe, up-to-date newspaper in every possible way. The pen of the Cardinal Archbishop of Pisa is never idle, as the aristocrats among the scientific periodicals of Europe can attest, for he is in the front rank of the astronomers of this continent. He is President of the Vatican Observatory. When Pius X decided a few years ago to reorganize the institution, he entrusted the entire management to Cardinal Maffi. He has been called—and truly so—

Civitatis ac patriae,
Religionis et Ecclesiae,
Constans fortisque defensor.

If we look for further examples in the Sacred College for powerful and practical upholders of the press, we may point out His Eminence Cardinal Hornig, Bishop of Veszprimia, Hungary (recently deceased), who edited the periodical *Religio* for eight years before being raised to the episcopal dignity.

Another able editor was the late Cardinal Gennari, who for a number of years prior to his death conducted *Il Monitore Ecclesiastico*, an Italian monthly dedicated chiefly to the subject of Canon Law. His successor is the Right Rev. Luigi

Lavitrano, Bishop of Cava and Sarno, a profound jurist and an able diocesan administrator, to whom Benedict XV recently sent, through the medium of the Papal Secretary of State, a letter conveying his strong appreciation of the work done by *Il Monitore* among the clergy and congratulating the Bishop on his ability "to alternate the cares of the episcopal ministry with noble studies of law."

Still another brilliant head of a periodical devoted to the same subject is the Right Rev. August Boudinhon, Pronotary Apostolic, a Frenchman, who was called to Rome last year to act as Rector of S. Luigi dei Francesi, the national church of France. Mgr. Boudinhon, who has the reputation of being one of the ablest, if not the chief of French jurists, edited *Le Canoniste Contemporain*. When he had settled into his new residence in S. Luigi dei Francesi last year the Holy Father directed that Mgr. Boudinhon be nominated Consultor to the S. Congregation of the Council, the S. Congregation of the Sacraments, and the S. Congregation of Studies, bodies in which profound learning is a *sine qua non*.

So much for the lights of higher realms. If we go down to the rank and file of the clergy, we find similar lively activity among them in the field of Italian journalism. In Florence the editor of *L'Unità Cattolica*, a Catholic militant daily, is Don Cavallcanti, a scholarly ecclesiastic, argus-eyed and strong of pen, of whom anti-religious journalists in this country entertain a salutary fear.

In every corner of Italy exist little weekly or bi-monthly two sheet productions, run on next to nothing, with the object of giving the local clergy as much annoyance as possible. Needless to say, "the Vatican" is given a share of all the vitriolic ink which these pestiferous little sheets can afford. Evidently then, it is incumbent upon the clergy and the earnest Catholics in the districts that are pestered by such cancrus growths to keep them from doing as much mischief as they can. Hence the number of useful and well written newspapers with which the priests of Italy are connected. Thus it is that Rome, Naples, Florence, Turin, Piacenza, Pisa, Milan, and the smaller cities and most of the large towns of Italy, have their respective Catholic organs of a militant species, manned by able priests and zealous laymen who exercise no small influence on the

manner in which their anti-religious contemporaries expend their energies in spattering ink.

JAMES P. CONRY,
Canon of St. Mark's, Rome.

"HEART" IS A BETTER WORD THAN "BOWELS", IN BIBLE TEXTS

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

Father Rickaby says in his scholarly notes: "It is time we were rid, everywhere in our English Bible, of the rendering *bowels*, and substituted *heart*, except where the word occurs in its physical sense".¹

Bowels should also be dropped from our prayer books. *Viscera*, the Latin word, and its corresponding Greek word, mean the whole interior of the body—brain, heart, entrails, etc.; and in a figurative sense, the interior of the soul—the affections. *Bowels* formerly was an accurate translation of *viscera*; but it has lost its wide meaning, and in common usage to-day means only the intestines. We no longer call the brain or heart a bowel.

It is unfortunate, for now we have no English word, unless perhaps insides, for all the internal organs, and so we are compelled to take into our language *viscus* and *viscera*. It is unfortunate also that we have lost "bowels" in its tropical sense, meaning the emotions of the soul, its common Scriptural meaning. "Heart" imperfectly takes its place, for the soul's emotions affect not only the heart, but the whole body, stomach, intestines, nerves, and even the skin, causing flush and pallor; but heart is the best substitute that we have. Compare e. g. the following versions:

In *visceribus* Jesu Christi.²

In the *bowels* of Jesus Christ.³

In the *tender mercies* of Christ Jesus.⁴

With the *tender affection* of Jesus Christ.⁵

With the *tenderness* of Christ Jesus.⁶

With *tender* Christian *affection*.⁷

With the *affection* of Christ Jesus Himself.⁸

¹ Rickaby, *Further Notes on St. Paul*, p. 192.

² Phil. i: 8.

³ Rhem. AV.

⁴ RV.

⁵ Baptist v.

⁶ 20th Cent. v.

⁷ Weymouth.

⁸ Moffatt.

In the *heart* of Christ Jesus.⁹

In the Benedictus: "Per *viscera* misericordiae Dei nostri" is rendered:

Bi the *inwardnesse* of the merci of oure god.¹⁰

Through the *bowels* of the mercy of our God.¹¹

Through the *tender* mercy.¹²

Because of the *tender* mercy.¹³

Because of the *heart* of mercy.¹⁴

Through the *tender* compassion.¹⁵

It might be rendered: Through the merciful (or compassionate) heart of our God.

Whilst the acolyte pours wine and water over the priest's fingers at Mass, the latter says: "May thy Body, O Lord, which I have taken, adhaereat *visceribus meis*." These words are translated:

Cleave to my *bowels*.¹⁶

Cleave to mine *inmost parts*.¹⁷

Cleave to my *breast*.¹⁸

The veils that enshroud our Saviour and conceal Him from sight, touch, and taste—the color, form and taste of bread—so long as they remain unchanged, retain Him, but after they begin to change He is gone.

The veils that hide the Real Presence, begin to change as soon as they are received into our mouths, and are gone shortly after being received into the breast or stomach. We do not pray that these veils may not change, in order to retain Jesus in His physical Presence longer, but that the effects of His Coming may stay in our souls, and in our bodies also, fitting them for a glorious resurrection. So, taking Father Rickaby's advice, we might translate: Stay in my *heart*.

⁹ "The best translation of this, to the modern Catholic ear, and an accurate version too, is *in the heart of Christ Jesus*, the heart being taken for the seat of affections as in our worship of the Sacred Heart. The R. V. *tender mercies* is somewhat out of point." Rickaby, p. 65.

¹⁰ Wiclif, Lk. 1: 78.

¹² AV et al.

¹⁴ RV m.

¹⁷ Lassance's *New Missal*.

¹⁵ Weymouth.

¹¹ Rhem, AV mg, 1st ed.

¹³ RV.

¹⁶ Raccolta appendix.

¹⁸ *The Mass*, Pace and Wynne.

Any ordinary man who gives it time and study, may hit upon some happy phrases, better than any that we now have, in translations of the Scriptures and the Liturgy. The following texts, e. g. from the Revised Protestant Version could be improved:

Wherefore my bowels sound like an harp for Moab, and mine inward parts for Kir-heres.¹⁹

My heart is like wax: It is melted in the midst of my bowels.²⁰

My bowels, my bowels! I am pained at my very heart.²¹

J. F. S.

CONDITIONAL ABSOLUTION "IN ARTICULO MORTIS."

Qu. Bertha is a zealous convert to the Catholic Church; her brother Paul is at her home, dangerously ill. Bertha desires very much to see her brother die within the fold of the Church. So she sends for a priest, who finds Paul in his last agony. She informs the priest that Paul is a rigid adherent of the Lutheran Church and asks that he be prepared for death without any mention of the doctrines of confession and purgatory. The priest elicits from the dying man an act of faith in the Unity and Trinity of God and also an act of universal contrition. He then absolves him conditionally. Paul dies. The priest, later, is requested by Bertha to have Paul buried in the Catholic cemetery, which is blessed, but meets the request with an emphatic refusal. What is your opinion of the priest's *modus agendi* in this case?

Resp. It is presumed that, in the circumstances, the priest has no reasonable doubt of the validity of Paul's baptism. We take for granted also that, in view of what Bertha tells him, he could not venture to obtain from the dying man a renunciation of heresy. Thirdly, the priest may prudently judge that Paul is a material heretic; that he is, as we say, in good faith. When these conditions are fulfilled, most theologians agree that absolution may be given *sub conditione*. Indeed, conditional absolution is permitted by some theologians even when the case is not so clear as this. For, as Buceroni reminds us, "In casu necessitatis licet uti opinione etiam tenuiter probabili in favorem periclitantis" (Cas. 2, n. 127, 5). Burial from the church and interment in the Catholic cemetery are matters,

¹⁹ Is. 16: 11.

²⁰ Ps. 22: 14—Cath. vers. 21: 15.

²¹ Jer. 4: 19.

however, which belong, so to speak, to external administration. We cannot lay down a general rule, except to call attention to the regulations of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, and to the policy of the Roman Congregations, which has been to refer doubtful cases to the judgment of the Ordinary. The new Code of Canon Law (Canon 1240) ordains: "Occurrente praedictis in casibus aliquo dubio, consulatur, si tempus sinat, Ordinarius; permanente dubio, cadaver sepulturae ecclesiasticae tradatur, ita tamen ut removeatur scandalum." The question is discussed in the first volume of the REVIEW (pp. 113 and 266).

EVASION OF RESERVATION.

Qu. Dr. X, a subject of diocese A, is the principal agent in procuring an abortion. He knows perfectly well that his sin is reserved to the bishop of his diocese. Expressly to avoid the law, and not to put his confessor to the trouble of applying for faculties, he crosses over to the neighboring diocese B, where the sin of abortion is not reserved. He goes to confession and confesses his sin, saying, "Father, when I came here I knew that this sin was reserved to the bishop of my diocese, and is not reserved here. My sole purpose in coming was to avoid the law of my diocese." Can the confessor absolve him? Is not this a plain case of acting *in fraudem legis*?

Resp. As there is no mention of reserved censure, it is taken for granted that there is question solely of absolving from a reserved sin. The physician in the case is a *peregrinus* in diocese B. Ordinarily, the jurisdiction of his confessor not being restricted in regard to the sin of abortion, he could be validly absolved. His case is complicated, however, by his open declaration that he acted apparently *in fraudem legis*. Nevertheless, the penitent's statement does not prove conclusively that he acted *in fraudem legis*, in the canonical sense. *Fraus legis*, strictly speaking, occurs when the penitent acts for the purpose of escaping the judgment of his own bishop ("declinare iudicium proprii pastoris"). The fact that he went into diocese B for the sole purpose of making his confession does not prove *fraus legis*, unless he intended, and we do not see any evidence that he did intend, to slight, so to speak, the authority of his bishop. A decree of the Holy

Office, 13 July, 1916, owing perhaps to the ambiguity that surrounded the phrase *in fraudem legis*, declares: "A peccatis in aliqua dioecesi reservatis absolvi possunt poenitentes in alia dioecesi ubi reservata non sunt, a quovis confessario, sive saeculari sive regulari, etiamsi praecise ad absolutionem obtinendam eo accesserint". And the new Code of Canon Law declares: "[Reservatio cessat] extra territorium reservantis, etiamsi dumtaxat ad absolutionem obtinendam poenitens ex eo discesserit" (Canon 900, n. 3). We think that the absolution in the case is valid; that the phrase "not to put his confessor to the trouble of obtaining faculties" should be given due weight, and that the expression "My sole purpose was to avoid the law of my diocese" meant no aspersion on the diocesan legislator, but means merely, "I came here for the sole purpose of making my confession".

FUNERAL MASS "IN DIE OBITUS."

Qu. When the news of the death of a person in a distant country, say of a soldier at the front, does not arrive until several days, or even weeks, after the *dies obitus*, can a funeral Mass be celebrated as *in die obitus*? Is there any explicit decree in the matter?

Resp. There is a general decree of the S. Congregation of Rites, dated 2 December, 1891, which, after declaring the days on which a solemn requiem Mass may be celebrated *praesente cadavere*, continues: "Denique, eadem Missa celebrari poterit pro prima tantum vice post obitum vel ejus acceptum a locis dissitis nuntium, die quae prima occurrat, non impedita a festo duplici primae et secundae classis vel a festo de praecepto; quo etiam in casu Missa dicenda erit ut in die obitus". (Decree 3755, N. III.) It is evident from the decree that this may be done notwithstanding the fact that the body has been interred elsewhere with a funeral Mass.

LAUDS AT OFFICE FOR THE DEAD.

Qu. When, immediately before a Requiem Mass, *absente cadavere*, the Office of the Dead is recited or sung, should the Office include Lauds or only one Nocturn, without Lauds? Theory and practice seem to be at variance in this matter.

Resp. The Roman Ritual, Tit. VI, Cap. 5, "De Officio faciendo in Exequiis, absente Corpore Defuncti et in die 3°, 7°, 30° et Anniversario" prescribes: "Officium mortuorum cum tribus nocturnis et laudibus et antiphonis duplicatis, vel saltem unum nocturnum cum tribus lectionibus et laudibus et Missa". That this rubric, however, is not strictly prescriptive as to the recitation or singing of Lauds is apparent from Cap. 3, n. 16 of the same Title of the Ritual. The rubric in this case has reference to the Office recited before the Mass, *praesente cadavere*, and reads: "Si vero ob rationabilem causam, videlicet ob temporis angustiam, vel aliorum funerum instantem necessitatem praedictum Officium Mortuorum cum tribus nocturnis et laudibus dici non potest . . . dicatur saltem primum nocturnum cum laudibus, vel etiam sine laudibus, maxime ubi ejusmodi viget consuetudo." If, where such a custom prevails, it is allowed, for a reasonable cause, to omit the recitation of Lauds in the services held *praesente cadavere*, it is fair to argue *a fortiori*, as Cardinal Gennari does,¹ that the recitation of Lauds may, in similar conditions, be omitted when the services are held *absente corpore defuncti*.

PRAYER FOR BISHOP IN CANON OF THE MASS.

Qu. When a titular bishop recites the Canon of the Mass, should he insert the name of the bishop in whose diocese he is celebrating, or should he, like the bishop of the diocese, insert the words "me indigno servo tuo"? We have not at hand the Pontifical or any other authority to decide this question.

Resp. The Pontifical, after prescribing the use of the words "et me indigno servo tuo," in the Mass celebrated by the bishop, adds, "Si vero celebrans non fuerit episcopus, omissis illis verbis, eorum loco dicat "et Antistite Nostro N." Since the titular bishop is really a bishop, he should, according to the Pontifical, use the first formula. As the rubricists somewhat quaintly express it, "Episcopi non orant pro aliis episcopis, quia non sunt ipsis superiores".

¹ *Quistioni Liturgiche*, p. 46.

ALCOHOL IN ALTAR WINE.

Qu. Some years ago I read in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW that the S. Congregation allowed a certain quantity of alcohol to be added to altar wine during the fermentation. Will you kindly let me know through the REVIEW whether any kind of alcohol will do, or must it be from grapes?

Resp. The decree in question is published in the REVIEW, Vol. XVI, pp. 96-298. It was issued by the Holy Office 7 August, 1896, and has been referred to more than once in these pages. It prescribes that the alcohol added be grape alcohol ("spiritus extractus ex genimine vitis"), and that it should not bring the alcoholic strength of the wine above seventeen or eighteen per cent. Pure wines, however, which naturally have an alcoholic strength in excess of eighteen per cent, are "materia apta."

PATRON OF AVIATORS.

Qu. Is there a patron saint of aviators, or a medal specially blessed for them?

Resp. So far as we have been able to ascertain, there has been nothing of an official nature determined or decreed in this matter. It is possible that, on special request, the devotion of a particular aviator to a certain saint may have been approved; but we have been unable to find anything authoritative.

REPRESENTATIONS OF THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

Qu. Are there any authoritative decrees in regard to the manner in which the Immaculate Conception should be represented in pictures, statues, and medals? Or, is the artist free to follow his own fancy? Is the mode of representation used in the "miraculous medal"—outspread hands radiating rays of grace, an aureole of nine stars, and the serpent under foot—formally approved?

Resp. There are decrees of the S. Congregation of Rites tolerating, but not prescribing, certain modes of representing the Immaculate Conception in Christian art. Father Nieuw-barn in his *Church Symbolism* writes (p. 116): "In more recent years this motive [the Immaculate Conception] has ob-

tained a more stereotyped form in the pictures of Our Lady of Lourdes. They represent the Blessed Virgin in the way she showed herself in many apparitions to Mary Bernadette Soubirous, in a white flowing dress, with light blue girdle, on the right arm a rosary with golden cross, the eyes lifted up to heaven, the hands crossed in prayer resting on her bosom, the feet standing on a half moon." The same author is authority for the statement that, except in pictures of the Immaculate Conception and the Holy Heart of Mary, the Mother of our Lord should never be separated from her Divine Son. As to the more general question, the artist is of course free to represent sacred subjects according to his own notions of artistic appropriateness. The Catholic artist will naturally respect Catholic tradition and the restrictions placed on his freedom by decrees such as those of the Council of Trent and the *Officiorum et munerum* of Leo XIII (1896).

INITIAL INVOCATIONS IN LITANY.

Qu. Recently a friendly dispute arose with regard to the invocations at the beginning of the Litany. Some say that those invocations must be duplicated. For instance, when the priest says: "Lord, have mercy on us", the congregation answers: "Lord, have mercy on us". Similarly, the invocation, "Christ, have mercy on us", is repeated. Others say that such duplications are wrong, except on Holy Saturday in the Litany of the Saints. These maintain that, when the priest says "Lord, have mercy on us", the people answer "Christ, have mercy on us". A solution in the REVIEW would be much appreciated.

Resp. Originally the invocations "Kyrie Eleison", "Christe Eleison" were chanted independently of the invocations of the saints which now constitute the major part of the Litanies. Sometimes they were chanted seven times, as in the Mass at the present time, sometimes five times, and sometimes only once, the choir repeating each invocation after the chanters. In regard to the Litanies as they now stand, with the invocations of the saints, it has been decided that in private devotions and in public recitations, not choral, it is sufficient, in order to gain the indulgences, to recite the litanies "ut jacent in breviario" without repetition. In the musical

rendition of the Litanies the usage prevails, and has not been condemned, of grouping, for example in the Litany of Loreto, several invocations under one response.

GENUFLECTING AT THE ANGELUS.

Qu. When the Angelus is recited standing, some people genuflect at the words "Et Verbum caro factum est", while others merely strike the breast. Is there any authoritative direction in this matter?

Resp. In Rome the general custom is not to genuflect at the words "Et Verbum caro factum est" in the Angelus. There is, however, no obligation to observe the Roman custom. Indeed, Cardinal Gennari¹ refers to the custom of genuflecting as "a pious and praiseworthy custom—pia e lodevole usanza". It is, nevertheless, desirable that, when several persons recite the Angelus together, there be a uniformity in the matter.

CHORAL RECITATION OF THE OFFICE.

Qu. A secular priest living as an oblate in a Benedictine monastery wishes to attend the monastic choir regularly. Does he, by doing so, validly and licitly satisfy his obligation of saying his Office?

Resp. In the case "validly" and "licitly" seem to us to be identical. If the choral recitation satisfies the obligation, there is no further question. However, apart from a special privilege that may be obtained, we think that the choral recitation does not satisfy the obligation. The S. Congregation of Rites was asked in 1899, "An satisfacit obligationi suae clericus in ordinibus sacris constitutus qui sponte vel invitatus se adiungit clero Officium ab Officio ipsius clerici diversum canenti vel recitanti." The answer of the S. Congregation was, "Generaliter negative". (Decree n. 4011, ad III.)

HEARING CONFESSIONS WITHOUT STOLE OR SURPLICE.

Qu. What is to be thought of the custom of hearing confessions without stole or surplice? Is it an abuse, or may the custom be tolerated?

Resp. The Roman Ritual (Tit. III, Cap. I, n. 9) does not rigidly prescribe the surplice and stole, but leaves the matter

¹ *Quistioni Liturgiche*, p. 493.

apparently to be decided by local custom. "Superpelliceo et stola violacei coloris utatur, prout tempus vel locorum feret consuetudo." And the S. Congregation of Rites, when asked, "An tolerari possit confessarios in ecclesia vel in sede confessionalis sacramentum poenitentiae frequenter ministrantes uti stola absque superpelliceo, aut vice versa"—where, it will be noted, it is a question of stole without surplice or of surplice without stole—answered simply: "Servetur Rituale Romanum" (Decree n. 3542). The custom in the United States is to use both surplice and stole when hearing confessions in the church.

"DOMINUS VOBISCU" NOT TO BE CHANTED IN LITANY.

Qu. When the Litany of the Blessed Virgin is sung in a collegiate chapel, in Latin, should the priest who sings the prayer at the end sing "Dominus vobiscum" before the versicle "Ora pro nobis"?

Resp. There is a decree of the S. Congregation of Rites, dated 20 November, 1891, which declares that the Roman Ritual should be followed in the matter. The Ritual prescribes the versicle "Ora pro nobis", etc., but makes no mention of the "Domine exaudi" or "Dominus vobiscum".

DISTRIBUTING COMMUNION AFTER THE CONSECRATION.

Qu. At the early Masses on Sunday, owing to the crowds who wish to receive, it is impossible for the celebrant to distribute Holy Communion and finish in time to allow the emptying of the church and the seating of the new congregation for the next Mass. It is customary to have another priest to assist him, who begins immediately after the Consecration to distribute Holy Communion. What I want to know is whether this priest is allowed to take the ciborium just consecrated and use it for the distribution of Holy Communion. Some say it is positively forbidden.

Resp. There is a decree which forbids the practice. The question put to the S. Congregation of Rites was, "Valetne sustineri usus aliquarum ecclesiarum in quibus, ratione concursus ingentis populi, cum non suffecerit multitudini pro S. Communionem quantitas hostiarum, jam subsequente alia Missa, statim a consecratione reassumitur distributio Communionis?" It is clear that the question refers to the occasion, frequent, perhaps, in which some of the faithful have had to remain over from an earlier Mass at which they could not receive Holy

Communion because the number of consecrated particles was not sufficient. The answer of the S. Congregation was, "Abusum esse interdicendum" (Decree n. 3448). It is true that in some city parishes there seems to be no alternative except to begin the distribution of Holy Communion before the Communion of the Mass. In such cases, it would be less unbecoming, we think, to use a ciborium other than that which has just been consecrated. The spirit of the liturgy would seem to demand that the particles consecrated at a Mass be allowed to remain on the altar until the Mass is essentially and integrally completed by the Communion of the celebrant.

A CHRISTMAS GIFT TO THE HOLY FATHER.

Some years ago a prominent priest in the United States proposed that the American Clergy make a special contribution in the form of a Christmas gift to the Sovereign Pontiff to relieve the necessities the Holy See was under as a result of the persecutions in France and other Latin countries. There had been a large falling-off of Peter's Pence as compared with what was received under a regime of the free exercise of religion in those countries. The REVIEW brought the appeal to the attention of its readers, and the Hierarchy seemed to favor the project. It required, however, an active leader among the heads of the Church in the United States to carry it into effect, and no bishop ventured to take the initiative.

The same proposal now comes from an ecclesiastic in high station who is a witness of the dire distress of the Roman people and the daily anxiety of the Holy Father to respond to the appeals made to him as the Common Guardian of Christians. The appeal is in the form of "Suggestions respectfully submitted" and outlines a plan of organization which, if taken up at once, would insure a worthy Christmas gift to the Pope from the American Clergy, independent of Peter's Pence. The writer suggests a meeting of the Bishops or Archbishops who might urge the movement in their respective dioceses and appoint a competent priest to take charge of it. Under such initiative the details would readily adjust themselves for the success of the enterprise. The suggestion comes to us as the REVIEW is about to go to press, and in bringing it to the notice of our readers we can only add that it has our most hearty endorsement.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE VERY REV. CHARLES HYACINTH McKENNA, O.P., P.G. Missionary and Apostle of the Holy Name Society. By the Very Rev. V. F. O'Daniel, O.P., S.T.M. Holy Name Bureau, New York. 1917. Pp. xiv—409.

Gradually Catholics in America are coming into possession of the biographies of the great missionaries of their faith. Within recent times the present REVIEW has contained accounts of books narrating the life of Father de Smet, the apostle to the Western Indians; of Father Mazzuchelli, the pioneer missionary of Wisconsin; of Father Nerinckx, the heroic herald of the faith in Kentucky. But all these were pioneer missionaries. They were sowers of the seed and planters for the most part in virgin soil, and in their case was verified the saying that it is one that soweth and another that reapeth and entereth into the harvest. This, however, is not always the case. Often the sower himself reaps the harvest. The later missionaries, those of the present and of recent generations, not only till but plant and garner also. Of this class was Father Charles McKenna, the subject of the biography before us. He was in no sense of the term a pioneer; neither was the scene of his labors any one section of the vineyard. He ploughed and tilled and planted and garnered over all the field of the Church in this country, or at least over that vast area that lies to the east of the Mississippi River. And the cultivation that fell to his lot was not only extensive; it was largely intensive in character. While he sowed and planted, he nurtured and fostered, trimmed and perfected. Making two of the Master's plants grow where one had grown before, his special solicitude was to bring each to the highest degree of fruitage. His therefore was not the eventful life of a de Smet in the midst of the tribes of savage Indians. Neither was it a life made up of tillages and reapings in sparsely settled regions and under primitive conditions, as was that of his brother in religion, Father Mazzuchelli. Rather was it a life characterized by the long-drawn-out and monotonous duties of the confessional and the strenuous and continued labor of preaching the Word. It was in the latter ministry that Father McKenna was most eminent and successful.

Amongst all those bands of laborers who for the last fifty years have been engaged in missionary work throughout this country, probably no individual priest was more widely, none more sincerely revered or more deeply loved, alike by the clergy and the laity, than was "dear old Father McKenna". There was no secret about the power of his eloquence. Nature had gifted him in presence, in form, in voice, in manner, to be an orator. He cultivated his powers and employed them successfully. But deeper than the outward strength and grace of oratory, lay the mightiness of a sincere heart, a consuming love of God and human souls and an unquenchable zeal to promote the one and save the other. No one ever listened to Father McKenna without being convinced of his sincerity and moved by his deep earnestness.

He was not remarkable for intellectual gifts. Sound judgment, good strong common sense, a knowledge of the human heart, was the background of his apostolic zeal and the force of his Celtic eloquence. He compiled several manuals of piety, chiefly in the interest of the devotion to the Holy Name and Our Lady's Rosary—the propagation and the organization of which practices of piety were closest to his heart and, together with his specifically missionary labors, absorbed his zeal and energy.

The history of his life, consequently, is rather the story of a soul, the laying bare of his inner life and character. There were not many nor striking deeds to chronicle in his career. The leading events of his life were summed up in the missions he gave, the effects of which are recorded more accurately in the Book of Life than in the statistics of parochial registers.

For the rest, the present biography tells with deep reverence and sympathy the story of his boyhood in Ireland, the severe trials and struggles of his young manhood in Lancaster, Pennsylvania; his college, seminary and novitiate career; and then the fifty years of incessant activity as a missionary up and down and across the land, until the toil-worn frame succumbed and the two years of helplessness ensued.

The final illness, while it deprived him of bodily activity, left his mind unweakened and unclouded. It was during this time of inaction that the present biographer and his associates gathered from Father McKenna the details of the latter's personal experience, so that quite unwittingly the venerable missionary produced indirectly his autobiography. The consciousness therefore that Father McKenna supplied at least the substance of the biography will no doubt enhance the value of the work in the eyes of his countless friends and admirers and insure for it a wide circle of readers.

THE CATHOLIC'S WORK IN THE WORLD. A Practical Solution of Religious and Social Problems of To-day. By the Rev. Joseph Husslein, S.J., Associate Editor of "America," Lecturer on Social History, Fordham University School of Sociology and Social Science, author of "The Church and Social Problems," etc. Benziger Brothers, New York. 1917. Pp. 286.

Have something definite to do that is worth doing — and do it. The maxim is extremely simple at first sight. So are all principles. It is when and where the application of the maxim to the concrete individual thing arises that the difficulty begins; or perhaps it seems to begin, when one is in the speculative, the dream mood. It usually disappears when you are in earnest and quite determined to do your best at the right thing. We all know of the Protestant minister who, speaking of the work of the laity, closed by inviting every one of the men who wanted to do something to meet him at once in the League room. Nearly every man complied. In the afternoon they were all out in groups of two making house-to-house visits and inviting every man to attend the church service. That evening the church was packed with men as it had never been before. A like plan was followed with equal success in regard to the women.

We find the story in the book before us, and it has its obvious moral. Devise a definite plan and assign the definite items thereof to definite, and capable, persons, and you can expect to attain a definite measure of success, provided you yourself keep back of your co-operators. This is all ideally sound and plausible. The story doesn't tell how long the men kept packing the church, nor how many of the devout female sex were backsliders.

However, Father Garesché, who is a specialist in the work of the laity, sums up the definite things that are being done, for instance, by certain Sodalities. By means of sections or committees, he says, "they are making a survey of the parish, organizing parish welfare sections, helping the poor and the sick, distributing Catholic literature, assisting the missions, teaching Catechism, looking after friendless boys and girls, promoting sociability among Catholics, aiding the parish schools and in many other ways acting as a zealous lay auxiliary to their pastors" (p. 77). To which illustration of efficient sodalism Father Husslein subjoins: "What wonders cannot similarly be accomplished by a militant Holy Name Society whose individual members have the idea of Catholic service and apostolate constantly brought home to them in a personal way!" And so on.

In the practical execution of beneficence, however, intelligence and prudence must direct and govern the program, and not every mind

possesses either the gubernative prudence or the technical knowledge needed for the organizing or the successful management of social activities. Here it is that a manual such as Father Husslein gives us will be welcomed by the uninformed and the inexperienced. Father Husslein speaks, as everybody knows, with expert knowledge on social problems, and there are few, if any, such problems whereof he has not something to say in this volume that is worth reading and heeding. This does not mean that he disentangles all the perplexities of modern life. A Daniel come to judgment, or even a Portia, could not do that. But at least he points the way and suggests the principles that solve very many of the difficulties. That is to say, he applies, or shows how to apply, the teachings of Christian ethics to the problems of modern life. If it be thought that many others have done and are doing the same, one might reply that not so many have done or are doing it in a manner that is as likely to gain a reading; for Father Husslein knows the true psychological method, that is, the art of reaching the intellect through the most appropriate imagery. Hence he has wrought out no didactic, cut-and-dried manual, but a living organism of practical truths and suggestions clad in a literary form that can hardly fail of winning for itself a welcome.

There is just one chapter with which some may be disappointed. It is headed "The Church and Sociology." When one comes to read it, he finds the Church, but no Sociology in the proper sense of the latter term. Sociology, the writer tells us, is "the science of charity and social justice," and this definition is carried through the article. Now this may be Sociology applied to social beneficence; or, so far as it designates a theory of beneficence it may be called, if you will, "social science," but it is not Sociology. Sociology is "the philosophy of society," the science that explains society in the light of fundamental principles. It is either that part of Moral Philosophy which is called *Ethica Socialis* in our manuals, or, better, it is an extension or development thereof. In the latter sense we have in English no book on Sociology from a Catholic point of view. And possibly Father Husslein himself may have sometimes felt at a loss what reading to recommend to an inquiring Catholic student attending Professor Giddings's lectures at Columbia. If he has ever experienced the difficulty of answering such an inquiry, perhaps Father Husslein may himself—few could do it better—take in hand, we had almost said, the creation of the desiderated manual, and thus do for Catholic Sociology what his brother in religion, Father Maher, did for Catholic Psychology—that is, provide a solid up-to-date work that can be used as a foil to Spencer, Giddings, and Ward.

LUTHER AND LUTHERDOM. From Original Sources by Heinrich Denifle. Translated from the second revised edition of the German by Raymond Volz. Vol. I, Part I. Torch Press, Somerset, Ohio. 1917. Pp. li—465.

No doubt most readers whose eyes rest upon the above title will feel that they already know all that they need to know, or surely all that they care to know, about Luther. If they have perused the six goodly octaves in which is comprised the English translation of Father Grisar's monumental work, it may well seem to them that nothing worth the saying remains to be told concerning the arch-reformer. Indeed, many will have found *The Facts about Luther*, so well put together by Monsignor O'Hare in his serviceable little volume, quite enough for at least all practical purposes. The real Luther has been revealed to the present generation, and all may know who care to know just what manner of man he was. He died and was decently buried some four centuries ago; and if all the weight of four hundred years, together with the accumulated mass of panegyric and laudation heaped upon him by his followers, could not hold down the stench of his memory, why offend the world's nostrils by exhuming and exhibiting the naked putridity? A reviewer is perfectly aware that he has to confront sentiments such as these when he calls attention to a new work on Luther. *Cui bono?* it will be said.

Nevertheless attention is very deliberately requested for the present volume. And why? In the first place, because it is the replica in English of one of the classics belonging to the literature that deals with the Reformation. The original is justly described as an "epoch-making" production—one that created a sensation in the world of scholars and that shook German Lutherdom to its foundations. In the second place, because the work is not a life of Luther, but a study of principles that are as broad as human nature. These principles are seen at work in the personality of Luther, and the study of his character serves to confirm and illustrate them.

Father Denifle did not originally plan a work on Luther. His task was to search out the causes that brought about the religious and especially the clerical decadence that characterized in particular the fifteenth century. In his quest he came upon Luther, who marks a certain acute stage in the disorder. The deeper Father Denifle entered into the Reformer's character as revealed in Luther's writings the more manifest it became that the latter's participation consisted primarily in giving expression and a more potent impulse to the downward movement—an avowedly explicit and a quasi-systematic justification of the prevailing corruption. Prior to Luther's open apostasy the moral decadence was indeed widespread, especially in

Germany and France. Its participants, however, had not lost the moral sense; much less had they striven to justify their iniquities. On the contrary, retaining, as they did, the consciousness of their guiltiness, many of them repented and earnestly strove to walk in the ways of virtue; and even to fall in with that movement of genuine interior as well as exterior reformation which always had a strong following and which led finally to the Council of Trent.

The source and spring of the stream of corruption is of course no secret. It flows with varying strength and velocity from the morass which lies at the bottom of human nature in its fallen condition, and whose outdraining into conduct can only be checked by unceasing vigilance and effort. The fifteenth century was a time when these checks upon passion seem to have been very generally relaxed. As Father Denifle points out, the characteristic note of the decline was to let oneself go, a shrinking from all effort and the actual avowal: "I cannot resist". The law was felt to be a burden and a barrier, and, above all, the commandment, "*non concupisces*", was declared by Luther himself impossible to obey. At first these principles found expression less in theory than in practice. And there was no general determination to bend the forces of the mind to the establishment of such a theory. Up to 1516, a year and a half before the Indulgence controversy, we find Luther in his lectures on the Epistles to the Romans bewailing the ever-spreading flood of corruption. While not infrequently recreant to his canonical duties, such as the recitation of the Office and saying Mass, he seems not to have lapsed openly from his religious vows. On the contrary, if one may judge from the accounts he gives toward the evening of his days regarding his life in the cloister, he was most rigorous with himself in repelling every form and degree of self-indulgence.

In his tractate *De votis monasticis iudicium*, however, which appeared at the end of 1521, and which Melanchthon extols as a highly learned work, he reveals his whole mind and heart relative to ascetical obligations—casting them not only aside but inveighing against them with all the vehemence and vituperative power of his passionate temperament. The work is therefore a key to Luther's true character. Besides this, it unlocks with equal sureness the reasons and motives of his cardinal doctrine, justification by faith alone. Since to curb the passions is in his teaching impossible for man, let everyone give them full rein; only let him believe that Christ has paid the price of his redemption and liberated him from the slavery of outward works, especially penance and confession.

The volume before us deals for the most part with the ethical teaching pervading Luther's treatise on monastic vows and with the relation of that teaching to his fundamental doctrine of justification.

It would be impossible as well as superfluous to enter into Father Denifle's searching and massively erudite study of these two supports of Luther and Lutherdom. Suffice it to say that it lays bare the inmost soul of the Father of Protestantism—unveils his sophistry and unmasks his hypocrisy and mendacity. The work is neither a life of Luther, nor is it meant to be a polemic against Lutherdom. It is this of course incidentally; but primarily and essentially it is a character study of the Reformer as revealed by his writings. The introduction presents a picture of the religious decadence prevalent during the fifteenth and the sixteenth century. The details of the picture are, it need scarcely be said, terrible and horrible. The sensitive, not to say the prudist—the epithet is the handiest one to fling at those who are afflicted with a delicate, albeit just, moral consciousness—may shrink from the accumulated evidences of filthiness. It is a pity that the veridical narration of historical events necessitates these descriptions. Yet so it is. Denifle's was a robust Teutonic soul, and he says right out that which he doth know, setting down naught in malice, yet extenuating nothing.

Besides the introduction just referred to, the volume comprises the first Book of the original. In it the author examines with his wonted keenness and astounding erudition the manner in which Protestant historians and theologians have treated their hero. Needless to say, nothing is left of the trappings and trimmings when this unsparing dissector lays down the knife.

The translator has accomplished his difficult task with credit to the original as well as to himself. The style is clear and readable, and bears the evidence of faithfulness. No doubt less of the latter quality would have added to smoothness and grace. Fidelity, however, is in all such cases the prime consideration.

VARIOUS DISCOURSES. By the Rev. T. J. Campbell, S.J. Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York; B. Herder Book Co., London. 1917. Pp. 354.

Father Campbell has been well advised—and he fortunately has heeded the advice—in collecting and committing to the present substantial volume these “remains of thirty-five years, or more, of his pulpit and platform work”. Most of the discourses, if not all of them, possess a permanent value and should not be left to the precarious receptacles of ephemeral periodicals. Their value is seen in the first place in the clear and steady light which they throw upon the important questions of the day. An instance of this may be seen in the discourse on Intellectual Education; another is that on Marriage; a third is offered by the Genesis of Socialism; a fourth by the True American School System; and so on.

A second point of merit lies in the historical content, and this not only in relation to the proximate occasions which called them forth, but also in their luminous, even though brief, treatment of early historical characters and events in this country. Witness for instance the papers on Father Rasle, on Jean Nicolet, and especially the one on The Eucharist in the Early Missions of North America. In these fields Father Campbell is of course at home, and it is delightful as well as instructive and edifying to read his vivid sketches of the noble deeds of heroes of the cross.

A third element that lends interest to the discourses is their earnestness and virility. They show a forcefulness of thought, and a fearlessness of utterance touched at times with a piquant wit, not to say sarcasm, which will prove a tonic to the anemic Catholic and brace him up with the consciousness of the strength of Catholic truth and the transcendent nobility of Catholic ideals.

For these and other reasons, the volume — which, by the way, is both worthy of its contents and reasonable in price—will appeal not less to the educated laity than the clergy.

CATHOLIC CHURCHMEN IN SCIENCE. Third Series. Sketches of the Lives of Catholic Ecclesiastics who were among the Great Founders in Science. By James J. Walsh, K.O.St.G., M.D., Litt.D. Dolphin Press, Philadelphia, Pa. Pp. x—121.

The reviewer of Professor Windle's *The Church and Science*, in the September number of the REVIEW, took occasion to couple the name and the apologetical work of Dr. James J. Walsh with the Irish Baronet's. Both of these Professors and Doctors of Medicine, these knighted and degreed scientists and scholars, the one of Ireland and the other of America, are doing their best to lay the ghost that still stalks across the benighted platform with its unsubstantial tale of opposition and conflict between the physical sciences and the doctrines of the faith. The only science the Church makes war on is the *camouflage* variety, not the genuine article. This, in a very direct and telling fashion, Dr. Walsh brings out in his new volume, the third of the series of *Catholic Churchmen in Science*.

Probably the most interesting chapters of the book are the two that tell the story of the research work of the Abbé Breuil and Dr. Obermaier into the modes of thought and manner of life of the cave men, the earliest ancestors of man in Europe. The scientific studies of these two zealous priests of this our own generation have unfolded one of the romances of modern science. Competent authorities have

not hesitated to say that the new facts which we are now for the first time learning in regard to the earliest known men in Europe will be among the most astounding scientific developments that have come to us for generations. The section of the volume that narrates the careers of these two scholarly priests—the one a Frenchman and the other a Bavarian—appeared in part in these pages recently; about half as much more has been added and is published for the first time, in the volume before us.

Another chapter which is interesting from a human point of view, but still more significant because of the light that it throws on the real relations between the Church and Science, is that which deals with Laboratories at the Vatican and Papal Scientists. How few Catholics—not to speak of others—know that some of the Cardinals seriously interested themselves in physics and physiology, or that some of the Popes set up public laboratories in the Vatican. Dr. Walsh in his very readable pages takes up the theme and gives us the facts about this phase of the Church's patronage of science.

Roger Bacon is the subject of the succeeding pages. This Franciscan Friar, who lived in one of the supreme periods in the history of humanity, was called the "wonderful teacher", *Doctor Mirabilis*. Just before the war, Oxford University celebrated in an elaborate set of exercises the seven-hundredth anniversary of his birth. That his memory should be thus honored in the university world hundreds of years after his birth stamps him as a remarkable man. It is worth while reading what Dr. Walsh has to tell about the intellectual and scientific accomplishments of this medieval priest and friar.

Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa, another famous scholar and scientist, who came two hundred years after Roger Bacon, has a chapter all to himself. And coming nearer to our own days we have Abbé Spallanzani, a clerical precursor of Pasteur. His work in the field of biology was quite remarkable, and has earned for him an illustrious name among the students of the history of science.

All in all, the volume well merits perusal, and deserves consideration when one is looking about for a suitable souvenir at this season.

OUR RENAISSANCE. Essays on the Reform and Revival of Classical Studies. By Henry Browne, S.J., M.A., New College, Oxford; Professor of Greek in University College, Dublin; Chairman of the Archaeological Aids Committee of the Association for the Reform of Latin Teaching. With a Preface by Sir Frederic Kenyon, K.O.B., Director of the British Museum. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1917. Pp. xvi—281.

HORACE AND HIS AGE. A Study in Historical Background. By J. F. D'Alton, M.A., D.D., Professor of Ancient Classics, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1917. Pp. xii—296.

It is a happy coincidence that these two books have come into the world at the same time. *Sic Parcae volverunt!* For if one were to look about for the realization of the ideal motivating the first of the couplet, he could find it nowhere more happily conveyed than by the second. What is that ideal? The revival of the classics and the reformation of classical studies. This is the purpose of the former of these volumes. And the second actually revives one of the greatest of the Latin classics by placing it in its original setting and by this very fact pointing out the way which is too often neglected by students and teachers of Horace. The work, therefore, while it revives a subject, helps to reform a method of study. The two authors thus share in the propaganda, and we trust the glory, of the new humanism. The elder humanism, that which preceded and in a measure occasioned and even caused the cataclysm of the sixteenth century, was a movement wherein the sensualistic elements of a recrudescing paganism intermingled with the philosophical, literary and artistic idealism which, while it had attained its fullest development in the golden age of Greek culture, embodied in reality the sanest traditions of humanity, the highest and noblest achievements of the human spirit.

In so far as the sensualistic element predominated, it brought about the moral decadence which made men ready to throw off the restraints of authority, divine and human, and to accept and spread the new Gospel of individual license whereof Luther was the most famous, or infamous, apostle. In so far as the second element prevailed, it merged with the general stream of spiritual culture and helped to swell the stream of truth and beauty which, though traditional in the race, reaches its fullest flood in the bosom of Christianity. Unfortunately, however, the idealistic elements of humanism find themselves not unfrequently at cross currents and sometimes in direct opposition with the trend of the physical sciences. This was the case when the new sciences began to feel the lustiness of their youth in the sixteenth and the seventeenth century and the opposition became still more pronounced in the second half of the nineteenth.

The reason of this latter phase of pronounced hostility is not hard to discover. It arose partly from the emptiness, fancifulness, and general aloofness from experience into which the transcendental philosophy inaugurated by Kant and terminated by Hegel and his followers had eventuated; and partly, perhaps mainly, in the tri-

umphs of physical science which brought the forces of nature more fully into the service of man. With the tendency to reduce first all physical and then all psychological phenomena to mathematical measurements came naturally the reaction, not only against metaphysics but also against the study of the ancient classics as the bearers of the higher intellectual culture of the past to the present. It must, however, be recognized that just as the humanism of the Renaissance was a revolt against the *abuse* of metaphysics, so the recent surrender of the mind to physical science was due in no small degree to the unfruitfulness, even from a purely cultural point of view, of classical studies, or rather to the false method pursued in those studies.

The opening sentence of the second of the two books above is a very moderate statement of what a great many, not to say the majority, of youths who have passed through the average college courses of Greek and Latin could easily do more than substantiate. "It too often happens," says Dr. D'Alton, "that classical texts are read with little consideration of the character of the age in which they were written. We are usually so engrossed with the linguistic study of an author, so intent on grappling with the subtleties of his grammatical structure, so satisfied with the plain and obvious meaning of his words, that we neglect to probe deeper and search for the influences which helped to color his thoughts and determine his outlook upon life. We are inclined to leave Higher Criticism as a practical monopoly to Biblical scholars, forgetting that writers are in most things children of their age, that they are immersed in its spirit, which often affects their intellectual being as profoundly and as intimately as their bodies are affected by their physical environment." And so on. In other words, the corpse of the ancient classics is dissected, and the soul, which needs must escape the scalpel, is undiscovered or left unstudied. There is classicism, with no humanism.

Happily, just as in the domain of science there is manifest a revolt of the mind against materialistic and agnostic science and a movement toward metaphysics, so there is a reaction toward a revival of classical studies and an organized movement to draw from those studies their genuine culture, their true wisdom, their value for the spirit, as well as their esthetic wealth. And if the movement had done nothing more than produce the two works placed at the head of this paper, it would have more than justified its existence. For in these two volumes we find on the one hand the character, the range and an illustration of its spirit and efficiency made manifest, and on the other hand, in the very manner and method with which the respective authors handle each his special subject, a splendid exhibition of the value and influence of classical studies.

Our purpose here is to enter into the details of neither volume. This would carry us beyond our fences. We must content ourselves with pointing out the spirit of each author and invite the lover of the classics to go farther afield, promising him both profit and pleasure.

The introductory chapter of the first volume embodies the address given by Father Browne at Chicago in April, 1916, before the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. It is a luminous survey of the nature of modern humanism, the present classical Renaissance. The outstanding idea is that the proposal is not to revive merely the literary form, the surface estheticism of the ancient classics, but also, beneath that form, the genuine human culture wherein are comprised both the philosophical, the scientific, and even the mathematical elements. In the first part of the volume ("The Voice of Hellas") the contents of this dominant idea are unfolded and finely illustrated under the headings of "The Pursuit of Beauty"; "Greece, the Cradle of Democracy"; "The Religious Sense" (of the Greeks).

The second part of the volume is essentially practical and deals chiefly with the means and methods of promoting the classical revival. The suggestions made are eminently sensible and practicable. They touch upon the materials of classical study, the personal work of the teacher, the necessity of eye teaching, visual illustrations; but particularly the utilization of public museums. The concluding eighty pages dealing with the latter topic are particularly instructive, and their suggestions, supplemented by the observations offered in the preface by the Director of the British Museum, will have special interest for professors of the classics in our colleges.

While Professor Browne focuses attention chiefly on the revival of the wisdom and the glory that once was Greece, Professor D'Alton confines himself to the Latin genius as represented by Horace. His aim has been, as he tells us, "to recapture . . . the atmosphere wherein the poet moved and to estimate the influences under which he penned his immortal verse. Most students of Horace quickly become acquainted with his domestic side, his loves and frolics, his friendship for Maecenas—*atavis editus regibus*—and his attachment to his Sabine farm. Unfortunately this view of his character has become traditional and is supposed to be a portrait of the whole man. Horace to many is simply the gay, light-hearted poet, the bon vivant, linked inseparably to his Sabine retreat, where he dwells in unalloyed happiness, careless of what the morrow may bring." Of course, he was all this; but he was much more. He had his serious side as well, and he reflects not a little of the political, philosophical, and religious opinions, as well as the currents of life of his time.

Just in this lies the value of the present study, that it represents the poet as influenced by all the complex life of the Augustan age and as in turn reacting and shaping in no slight degree his immediate environment. The author introduces us to Horace's religious and philosophical opinions; his thoughts on the social problems of his age; on popular beliefs. The volume analyzes his theories on literature and his rôle as a literary critic. There is obviously room for much latitude of opinion on such matters, and the danger lies in projecting one's own views into the evidence and making the latter subserve the former. Professor D'Alton, it need not be said, is perfectly conscious of such a danger and the discerning reader will recognize the care exercised throughout by the author not to overstep the limits of the evidence supplied by the poet himself. The picture is a many-sided portrait of Horace—the man, the thinker, the poet—and of his entourage, intellectual, moral, social, political. There are many personages on the canvas and many impersonal elements; but they all converge toward the central figure which gives unity to the variety.

If the classical revival so ably advocated by Father Browne is to progress—and the indications thereof are not unhopeful—and if the reformation in the method of studying the classics is to be furthered—and the signs of this are likewise encouraging—both these movements, or rather both sides of the one single movement, will be powerfully aided by the employment of such a study and such a method as are exhibited by Professor D'Alton in his picture of the historical setting of the great Roman lyrist. The work is the best key to the cultural value of the classics.

THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA. By Thomas Kilby Smith, of the Philadelphia Bar. Preface by Walter George Smith, of the Philadelphia Bar. The Encyclopedia Press, Inc., New York. 1917. Pp. xi—318.

We have here the first number of a projected series of handbooks, the purpose of which is to present in succinct form the leading facts concerning the history, development, and present status — industrial, social, and political—of the individual commonwealths of the Union. If the present volume may be taken as a measure of the excellence to which its successors are to conform, the publishers will have placed the reading public under an intellectual indebtedness second in magnitude only to that which is represented by their monumental production, the *Catholic Encyclopedia*.

It is not overstating things to say that there exists no single volume which covers precisely the same ground as does the present manual. The book not only surveys the history of Pennsylvania; it expounds

the governmental organization of the State, describes the manner and customs of the people, explains its military and its financial mechanisms, analyzes its social systems and the civil and legal status of the family; the organization of education, in its various grades and spheres, and in its range over literature, the arts and sciences. Lastly, there is a special chapter on penology. Of special interest and value is the chapter devoted to religion. It is probably the first book on Pennsylvania to do anything like justice to the history and influence of the Catholic Church in the Keystone State. As the book is intended for the general reader, the author, though himself a Catholic, has dealt with the history of the Church within the State not *in extenso* but with fullness proportionate to the part played by Catholicism in the general life of the Commonwealth. From this point of view the work ought to be of interest alike to Catholics and non-Catholics.

A valuable feature of the little book is the bibliography. To each chapter is appended a list of the more important and easily available books pertinent to the special topic. The volume is illustrated with a number of photographs and maps, while a good index places the details of the text within easy reach. It may be superfluous to add that the publishers have given the whole an apt and a worthy setting.

LAWS OF PHYSICAL SCIENCE. A Reference Book. By Edwin F. Northrup, Ph D., Palmer Physical Laboratory, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia and London. Pp. ix—210.

The readers of this REVIEW are not supposed to be, nor need they be, proficient in the physical sciences. Yet, the more they are acquainted or familiar therewith, the better, *ceteris paribus*, will they be equipped for their vocation as Divinely sent ambassadors, seeing that God's manifestation of Himself in the physical universe is both the anticipation and a manifold illustration of His revelation through accredited authority. Moreover, how often in one's reading does one come across statements concerning "the laws of nature", about which one may perhaps be in doubt whether the label is justly applied or not; and one goes groping about for that manual of physics which he conned away back in the last century, forgetful of the fact that the crabbed little book slipped long ago with its coating of dust into the bag of the ragman. Anyhow one often wants to verify a fact or a statement of this kind and he usually cannot put his hand on the proper source. It is right here that the little manual before us proves its usefulness. Within less than two hundred pages we have a summary of the generalizations of Physics — some of which

are verified "laws", others not quite so determined and certain—classified under the head of mechanics, hydrostatics, hydrodynamics, capillarity, sound, heat and physical chemistry, electricity and magnetism, and light. There is also an appendix containing a good bibliography and index; so that one can quickly and easily get at the object of one's quest and then can go deeper into the thing according to need or desire.

The manual therefore fully justifies its sub-title. It is a reference book—one that will prove useful both to the busy student of physical science and to the general reader.

Literary Chat.

While Shepherds Watched, by Richard Aumerle Maher, is the title of a Christmas book of unusual appeal, the appeal of the power of love and tenderness and beauty which belongs to no story so uniquely as to that of Nazareth and Bethlehem. Those who know the author's other books—one of which, *The Heart of a Man*, first made its appearance in these pages—need not be told that this, his latest, work has in it the elements of strength and directness, pathos and humanness, freshness and originality which are so singularly Father Maher's own, and which, permeating its predecessors, placed them in a category quite by themselves.

The divine story of the Word, of Gabriel and the Mother; the "Magnificat" and the Voice of the Dumb breaking forth in the "Benedictus"; of lowly Nazareth, where the Angel spoke and lonely Bethlehem where the shepherds watched—the eternal story of time, it can never be new for it must be old, can never be old for it is ever new. It keeps in Father Maher's paraphrasing and interpreting all the strength of its eternal life and all the freshness of its unfailing youth. The book-maker's art has clad the story in a fitting garment and has set the jewels in a worthy casket. The volume, containing but one simple though expressive picture, is neatly printed and chastely decorated with head pieces. (The Macmillan Co., New York.)

If you are looking for light on *The Mexican Problem*, you will find a good deal of it in Mr. Barron's little volume which bears the title here italicized. Mr. Barron views the situation purely on its economic side, and he offers nothing more than "a business solution". What Mexicans need, he says, is "opportunity to labor, opportunity for the family, opportunity for food, clothing, better shelter, and better social conditions". How this opportunity may be secured is told by Mr. Talcott Williams in his preface to the volume. Let the United States give to Mexico what it gave to Cuba and the problem will solve itself. That is, "give her protection for order, courts, contracts, industries and sanitation, for a brief space—one, two or three decades—and the splendid qualities of the Mexican people would do the rest. Keep order, create courts, educate a generation, turn out typhus and tropical diseases—and the quick teachableness of the Mexican can be trusted to maintain what it secures under tutelage, and to add to it."

That is all very well. The chief trouble lies in the unwillingness of the Mexican government to allow us to come into their house and tidy up things; or in our unwillingness or inability (just now at least) to go in and make

things ship-shape. Neither Mr. Barron nor Mr. Williams tells us how the perplexing problem of recalcitrant will is to be solved. However, from an economic point of view the book is valuable for the information it supplies regarding the industrial resources and opportunities of the country, particularly in the oil regions. Mr. Barron, moreover, being a journalist of long and wide experience, knows how to put things directly, forcibly, and attractively. There is nothing "dismal" about his economics.

It is a pity that the verses "A America Loca" by Santos Chocano, who signs himself "Peruvian and Colonel in the Constitutional Army (late 1903)," were given a place in this otherwise commendable production. They are neither good poetry nor good history. Some of the lines are false and misleading. There are in Mexico some 10,000,000 pure Aztecs and about 5,000,000 of partially Aztec origin. It is safe to say that these fifteen millions would have met with the same fate as has fallen to the lot of the northern Indians, had it not been for the heroic efforts of "the priest with his furious ritual and Inquisitorial phantoms"! Perhaps the soldier-poet would do well to read—that he has not done so one may infer from his misleading allusion to "Fray de las Casas"—*The Spanish Pioneers* by Charles Lummis. This fair-minded American writer, although not a Catholic or even a Spaniard, gives quite an opposite view of the Conquistadores from that which animates some of Signor Chocano's verses.

Mr. Barron's book is published in their characteristic good form by Houghton Mifflin Company (Boston and New York).

No one longs more fervently for the union of Christendom, it may readily be conceived, than the Vicar of Christ in Rome; but, and that is not always clearly understood by those who work for the reunion of the separated churches, his hands in this matter are tied by the duties of the sacred office which he bears in the name of his Master. The divine truth which he holds in trust, he may in no way compromise. Union bought at the price of truth, he cannot consider. In this respect his attitude must be unyielding. Hence, it becomes an impossibility for him to treat, on equal terms, with the churches seeking reunion. Harsh though it may sound, in the nature of the case there is but one way to reunion on the part of the non-Catholic churches, and that is through submission. Modes of reunion, based on any other condition, though they may be prompted by true zeal, will prove abortive. It is to be feared that the plan proposed in a little pamphlet entitled *De Unione Ecclesiarum*, unfortunately belongs to this category. Yet it would be wrong to regard this forcible and inspired plea as useless. It will strengthen the desire for unity and set men thinking, especially as it is written in such a charitable and conciliatory spirit and is so utterly free from controversial bitterness. What the author says of the evils of disunion and the need of greater charity will strike a sympathetic chord in the heart of every reader. Only good can come from a wide diffusion of this powerful and urgent appeal. (R. H. Gardiner, P. O. Box 436, City of Gardiner, Maine.)

Save the boy and you will save the man. Save the man and you will save the woman. Is that it? Or is it thus: Save the girl and you will save the woman. Save the woman and you will save the man. It is solely neither, and it is partly both. *Latet dolus in generalibus—sicut anguis in herba*. Anyhow the first way of putting it spells the harder problem, and you need more helps to solve it. Of the real serviceable helps the good book is easily among the first, the most effectual, and the easiest and handiest to employ.

We have not as yet got all the good books we want or need for Catholic boys. We haven't anything like the number there is for non-Catholic youths; no legion of stories pouring forth from the pens of the Oliver Optics, the Hentys, the Castlemons, the Rollos, and the rest. Fortunately, many if not all

of these stories are sound, healthy, interesting books, which Catholic boys may read with advantage as well as delight. All the same, we could wish that we had more Catholic men at work on books for Catholic boys—books that would be not only pleasant to read but pervaded by a genuine uplifting spirit that touches the boy's insides without working in a sermon.

Father Francis Finn, S.J., is of course one of our few men who know how to write *for* boys without writing *at* them. The proof of the fact is that boys like his stories. *Lucky Bob*, the latest book of the author of *Tom Playfair*, is sure to get into the genuine boy; for Bob is certainly a real live boy, and boy speaketh unto boy, even as heart unto heart. Perhaps critical old boys won't believe there ever was such a young boy as Bob. Just as they once said there were no cupids in *Campion*. Anyhow, if there isn't, there ought to be, and the reading of *Lucky Bob* will help to make them, or make at least accessions to the type. (Benziger Brothers, New York.)

Another writer who knows the soul of the boy and knows how to get inside the sanctum is Father Spalding, S.J. His recent story, *At the Foot of the Sand-Hills*, is bound to grip the red-blooded boy and hold him fast to the end. It's all about life in the open—shooting prairie-chickens, ducks and wild geese out on the breezy plains of Nebraska. There's something doing all the time, and the picture of the terrible sand-storm is vibrant enough to send a thrill down the spinal cord of even the grown-ups. (Benziger Brothers.)

The *Boyhood of a Priest* is the title of a wee booklet—the size of your palm and bright to the eye and smooth to the touch—which you will want to put into the hands of that youth whom you see every morning, or every Sunday, at the altar-rail. You feel that God is whispering something into his soul about a consecrated life, and you want him to heed the call and to keep him true and clean and bright. Well, give him the little red book and you can feel surer that he is safe. The Rev. W. H. Pollard writes a wise and a neat introduction. The other four-score pagelets are by Armel O'Connor. Mr. O'Connor is a poet and therefore he knows the *heart* of a boy. He's a man of experience and observation and therefore knows the *head* of a boy. He's an all-around cultured writer and therefore knows how to open the springs of fancy and of feeling and send his thoughts straight into the soul of the boy. The boyhood of a priest is safe under such a guide. (Benziger Brothers.)

A wee booklet which is to the eye the facsimile of the one just noticed bears the title *Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Jesus*, by the Rev. R. Ratcliffe, S.J. In crystal-clear language it explains the nature of that devotion, its characteristics, advantages, and reward. Materially the covers include just a hundred pages; but from a doctrinal and a devotional point of view they encase a rich spiritual treasury. The neat volume makes an appropriate gift at Christmas-tide or indeed for almost any religious occasion. (Benziger Brothers, New York.)

A sketch of *St. Joseph's Parish*, Erie, Pennsylvania, has been prepared by Monsignor H. C. Wienker, organizer of numerous parishes in the Diocese, founder and editor for a number of years of an excellent school journal and a man of original methods in parish management. The volume tells, in English and in German, the story of pastoral activity from the founding of the church in 1867 to the present year, which marks its golden jubilee. The book furnishes an object lesson in successful church work and is an instructive addition to the historical records of the Church in Pennsylvania.

Books Received.

SCRIPTURAL.

NOS QUATRE ÉVANGILES. Leur Composition et leur Position Respective. Étude suivie de quelques procédés littéraires de saint Matthieu. Par E. Levesque, Professeur d'Écriture sainte au Séminaire Saint-Sulpice. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1917. Pp. 352. Prix, 4 fr. 45 *franco* (majoration de 20% comprise).

COURTES GLOSES SUR LES ÉVANGILES DU DIMANCHE. Par S. G. Mgr. Landrieux, Évêque de Dijon. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1917. Pp. 429. Prix, 5 fr. 75 *franco* (majoration de 20% comprise).

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

THE MEDIATOR. Jesus Christ in the Scriptures, Model of the Priest. By the Rev. Peter Geiermann, C.S.S.R. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis and London. 1917. Pp. 294. Price, \$1.50.

THE BOYHOOD OF A PRIEST. By Armel O'Connor, author of *The Exalted Valley*, *Poems*, etc. With an Introduction by the Rev. W. H. Pollard, of the Society of Charity. Benziger Bros., New York. 1917. Pp. 109.

DEVOTION TO THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. By the Rev. R. Ratcliffe, S.J. Benziger Bros., New York. 1917. Pp. 111.

VARIOUS DISCOURSES. By the Rev. T. J. Campbell, S.J. Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., New York; B. Herder Book Co., London. 1917. Pp. 354. Price, \$2.00 *net*.

THE "REFORMATION" CONDEMNED BY THE WORLD'S BEST HISTORIANS. Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Indiana. Pp. 40. Price, \$0.05; \$2.00 a hundred.

LE MERVEILLEUX SPIRITE. Par Lucien Roure, Rédacteur aux *Études*. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1917. Pp. 398. Prix, 4 fr. 45 *franco* (majoration de 20% comprise).

A HANDY COMPANION. Dedicated to Our Soldiers and Sailors and to the Honor and Glory of the Cross and Flag. By a Vincentian Father. H. L. Kerner & Co., Philadelphia. 1917. Pp. 105. Price: \$0.10 to \$1.00.

WHILE SHEPHERDS WATCHED. By Richard Aumerle Maher. Decorations by Charles R. Stevens. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1917. Pp. 159. Price, \$1.25.

MARIAN POEMS. Contributed to *The Queen's Work Poetry Contest*, 1916-1917. The Queen's Work, St. Louis. 1917. Pp. 46. Price, postpaid: paper, \$0.28; cloth, \$0.53.

THE STUDENTS' MISSION CRUSADE. Bulletin No. 1 of the Students' Mission Crusade Bureau, Techny, Illinois. October, 1917. Pp. 31.

PHILOSOPHICAL.

THE CATHOLIC'S WORK IN THE WORLD. A Practical Solution of Religious and Social Problems of To-day. By the Rev. Joseph Husslein, S.J., Associate Editor of *America*, Lecturer on Social History, Fordham University School of Sociology and Social Service, author of *The Church and Social Problems*, etc. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 286. Price, \$1.00 *postpaid*.

OUR RENAISSANCE. Essays on the Reform and Revival of Classical Studies. By Henry Browne, S.J., M.A., New College, Oxford; Professor of Greek in University College, Dublin; Chairman of the Archeological Aids Committee of

the Association for the Reform of Latin Teaching. With a Preface by Sir Frederic Kenyon, K.C.B., Director of the British Museum. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1917. Pp. xvi—281. Price, \$2.60 *net*.

HORACE AND HIS AGE. A Study in Historical Background. By J. F. D'Alton, M.A., D.D., Professor of Ancient Classics, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1917. Pp. xii—296. Price, \$2.00 *net*.

LAWS OF PHYSICAL SCIENCE. A Reference Book. By Edwin F. Northrup, Ph.D., Palmer Physical Laboratory, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia and London. Pp. ix—210. Price, \$2.00 *net*.

CONTEMPORARY THEORIES OF UNEMPLOYMENT AND OF UNEMPLOYMENT RELIEF. By Frederick C. Mills, Ph.D., sometime Garth Fellow in Economics, Columbia University. (Vol. LXXIX, No. 1, of *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*. Edited by the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University.) Columbia University Press or Longmans, Green & Co., New York; P. S. King & Son, London. 1917. Pp. 178. Price, \$1.50.

MEN OF THE OLD STONE AGE. Their Environment, Life and Art. By Henry Fairfield Osborn, Sc.D., Princeton; Hon. LL.D., Trinity, Princeton, Columbia; Hon. D. Sc., Cambridge; Hon. Ph. D., Christiania; Research Professor of Zoology, Columbia University; Vertebrate Palaeontologist, U. S. Geological Survey; Curator Emeritus of Vertebrate Palaeontology in the American Museum of Natural History. Illustrations by Upper Palaeolithic Artists and Charles R. Knight, Erwin S. Christman and others. Second edition. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1916. Pp. xxvi—545. Price, \$5.00 *net*.

THE ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION OF LIFE. On the Theory of Action, Reaction and Interaction of Energy. By Henry Fairfield Osborn, Sc.D., Princeton; Hon. LL.D., Trinity, Princeton, Columbia; Hon. D. Sc., Cambridge; Hon. Ph. D., Christiania; Research Professor of Zoology, Columbia University; Vertebrate Palaeontologist, U. S. Geological Survey; Curator Emeritus of Vertebrate Palaeontology in the American Museum of Natural History; author of *From the Greeks to Darwin*, *The Age of Mammals*, *Men of the Old Stone Age*. With 136 illustrations. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1917. Pp. xxxi—322. Price, \$3.00 *net*.

HISTORICAL.

LUTHER AND LUTHERDOM. From Original Sources by Heinrich Denifle. Translated from the second revised edition of the German by Raymund Volz. Vol. I, Part I. Torch Press, Somerset, Ohio. 1917. Pp. li—465. Price, \$3.50.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF MAGGIE BENSON. By Her Brother, Arthur Christopher Benson, Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge. Longmans, Green & Co., New York and London. 1917. Pp. 446. Price, \$2.50 *net*.

THE VERY REV. CHARLES HYACINTH MCKENNA, O.P., P.G. Missionary and Apostle of the Holy Name Society. By the Very Rev. V. F. O'Daniel, O.P., S.T.M. The Holy Name Bureau, 871 Lexington Ave., New York. 1917. Pp. xiv—409.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS AND ADDRESSES OF FOURTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING, Catholic Educational Association, Buffalo, New York, 25-28 June, 1917. (Vol. XIV, No. 1, *Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, 1651 East Main Street, Columbus, Ohio. November, 1917.) Pp. viii—511. Annual Individual Membership Fee, \$2.00.

THE VOICE OF BELGIUM. Being the War Utterances of Cardinal Mercier. With a Preface by Cardinal Bourne. Burns & Oates, Ltd., London. 1917. Pp. ix—330. Price, 2/6.

HISTORY OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS IN NORTH AMERICA, COLONIAL AND FEDERAL. By Thomas Hughes, of the same Society. Text. Vol. II: From 1645 till 1773. With six maps. Longmans, Green & Co., London and New York. 1917. Pp. xxv—734. Price, \$8.00 *net*.

THE LIFE OF AUGUSTIN DALY. By John Francis Daly. The Macmillan Co., New York. 1917. Pp. xi—672. Price, \$4.00.

THE LIFE OF FRANCIS THOMPSON. By Everard Meynell. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1916. Pp. 361.

ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH, ERIE, PENNSYLVANIA. Its Origin and Growth, together with Biographical Sketches of its Pastors and Assistants, and an Outline of Erie's Primitive History. Richly illustrated. Souvenir of the Golden Jubilee, 1867-1917. Pp. 118.

NEW YORK AS AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY MUNICIPALITY PRIOR TO 1731. By Arthur Everett Peterson, Ph.D., Instructor in History, Evander Childs High School, New York. (Vol. LXXV, No. 1, of *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*. Edited by the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University.) Columbia University Press or Longmans, Green & Co., New York; P. S. King & Son, London. 1917. Pp. 199. Price, \$2.00.

NEW YORK AS AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY MUNICIPALITY, 1731-1776. By George William Edwards, Ph.D., Instructor in History, Stuyvesant High School, New York. (Vol. LXXV, No. 2, of *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*. Edited by the Faculty of Political Science, Columbia University.) Columbia University Press or Longmans, Green & Co., New York; P. S. King & Son, London. 1917. Pp. 206. Price, \$2.00.

"PAGES ACTUELLES", 1914-1917: No. 110, *Pierre I^{er}, Roi de Serbie*. Par René Chambry. Pp. 46. No. 111, *Alphonse XIII et les Œuvres de Guerre*. Par Albert Mousset. Pp. 47. Bloud & Gay, Paris et Barcelone. 1917. Prix, o fr. 60 par volume.

LA GUERRE INJUSTE. Lettres d'un Espagnol. Par A. Palacio-Valdès, de l'Académie Espagnole. Traduction de A. Glorget. Bloud & Gay, Paris et Barcelone. 1917. Pp. 239. Prix, 3 fr.

L'ESPAGNE ET LA GUERRE. L'Esprit Public. La Situation Politique. Par Redacteur au *Correspondant*. Quatrième édition. Bloud & Gay, Paris et Barcelone. 1917. Pp. 256. Prix, 3 fr. 50.

MISCELLANEOUS.

AT THE FOOT OF THE SAND-HILLS. By the Rev. Henry S. Spalding, S.J., author of *The Camp by Copper River*, *The Old Mill on the Withrose*, etc. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 199. Price, \$1.00 *postpaid*.

THE RUBY CROSS. A Novel. By Mary Wallace. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 303. Price, \$1.35 *postpaid*.

IN SPITE OF ALL. A Novel. By Edith Staniforth. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1917. Pp. 289. Price, \$1.35 *postpaid*.

MOSETENO VOCABULARY AND TREATISE. By Benigno Bibolotti, Priest of the Franciscan Mission of Inmaculada Concepcion de Covendo in Bolivia. From an Unpublished Manuscript in possession of Northwestern University Library. With an Introduction by Rudolph Schuler, formerly of the Museu Goeldi, Para, Brazil. Northwestern University, Evanston and Chicago. 1917. Pp. cxlii—141.

THE CHRISTIAN UNION QUARTERLY. A Journal in the Interest of Peace in the Divided Church of Christ. Issued in January, April, July and October. Edited by Peter Ainslie, Seminary House, Baltimore. October, 1917; Vol. VII, No. 2. Pp. 80. Price, \$0.50; \$2.00 a year.

INDEX TO VOLUME LVII.

	PAGE
Absolution, Conditional, "in articulo mortis"	676
of Suicide	432
from Reserved Censures	313
"Acta Apostolicae Sedis": Its Authority	561
Advent Fast Days: New Laws	543
Alcohol in Altar Wine	680
All Souls' Day: Application of Masses	272
Feast of Double Rite of First Class	271
Altar Boy's Surplice: May Lace be used?	83
Main: Statues thereon	200
Privileged: Doubts solved	538
Wine: Percentage of Alcohol	680
America's Patron, Saint Rose of Lima	631
Angelus: Genuflecting or Standing thereat	682
Antependium, Color of, at Requiem Mass	202
Artistic Work among the Cave Men	257, 523
<i>Ave Maria</i> established by Father Sorin	233
Aviators: Their Patron Saint	680
Bankruptcy: Case of Restitution	307
Baptism: Changes in the New Ritual	129
Changes in the Form	433
Legislation of the New Code	492
Baptismal Salt: May it be distributed to Parishioners?	436
Barry (Rev. David) on Priest's Intention at Mass	237, 666
Bauer on Jewish and Gentile Converts to Christianity	565
Benedict XV and the Order of Preachers	65
His Franciscan Ancestors	606
Priest's Christmas Gift	684
"Benedicite": Recitation of Canticle after Mass	559
Benediction with Ciborium	557
Bishop: Diocesan Curia, according to New Code	365
New Regulation on Preaching	381
Pastor's Permission to leave Parish	557
Prayer for Bishop in Canon of Mass	679
Secrecy about Investigations of Candidates	78
Black or Violet Chasuble for Dead Priest	559
Blessed Sacrament: Legislation of New Code	495
Body: When does the Soul enter it?	281
"Bowels" in Bible Texts: "Heart" is better Word	674
Brentwood: New Diocese in England	660
Breuil, Abbé Henri: Sketch of His Cave Men Studies	257, 523
Burial in Protestant Cemetery	88
Candle, three-branched, on Holy Saturday	205
Catafalque "absente cadavere"	203
Catechist and Preacher: Priest's Duty	390
Catholic Journalism in Italy	668
Cavanaugh (Very Rev. John): Letter from Pope Benedict XV	236
Cave-Men Artists: Remarkable Discoveries	257, 523
Their Time and Place in World History	523
Cemetery: Burial in Protestant	88
Catholic, Burial of Protestant therein	204
Question of Blessing	561
Chalice: Consecration before paying for same	319
Chasuble, Black or Violet, for Dead Priest	559
Chaucer: His Description of Clerics in Medieval England	32, 152
Child Jesus: Devotion to Divine Infant	592
Christmas Gift from Priests to Holy Father	684
Christological Theories discussed by Rev. Walter Drum, S.J.	438, 565
Ciborium used for Ostensorium at Benediction	557
City and Country: Vocations to Priesthood	206
Code of Canon Law: Commission for its Interpretation	662
Some Canons now operative	371, 537, 636
Text-Books in Seminaries	537
Colby (Elbridge) on Priest in Medieval Literature	30, 152

	PAGE
Colclough (Mr. John D.) criticizes Canon Sheehan's Books	274
Commission for Interpretation of Code of Canon Law	662
Communion: Case of Invalids not Fasting	316
Distribution after Consecration	683
Laws of New Code	496
Confession: Case of Evasion of Reservation	677
Hearing same, without Stole or Surplice	682
in Sacristy	85
Legislation of New Code	497
Monthly or Weekly for Indulgences	430
of Deaf Mutes	78
Confessors of Religious: Questions answered	186
Confirmation: Legislation of New Code	495
Confraternity of Divine Infant	605
Congregation, kneeling, standing, sitting at Mass	434
Sermon, Preacher	465
Conroy (V. Rev. Canon J. P.) on Catholic Journalism in Italy	668
Consecration: Intention of the Priest at Mass	238, 666
of Chalice: Doubtful Mutilation discussed	319
Conversation at Table for Priests	151
Cooper (The Rev. John M.) on Freemasonry	43, 164
Corporal: Consecration of Fragments thereon	245
Country and City Vocations to Priesthood	296
Cronin (Dr. Michael) on Newman's Argument for Existence of God	547
Cross of Primates and Metropolitans	364
Crusade of Grace: St. Rose of Lima	635
Currier (Bishop Charles Warren) on Virgin Islands	247
Dancing at Parish Picnics	201
Danes settled on Island of St. Thomas in 1671	247
Day (Monsignor Victor) on Instructions at Sunday Masses	423
Day Retreats or Missions?	300
Deaf-Mutes: Their Confessions	78
Dean and Vicar General: Question of Precedence	318
Delegation not needed for Validity of Marriage	317
Diet of whimsical Assistant Priests	144
Diocesan Consultors, according to New Code	366
Dispensation: Case of "Mixtæ Religionis"	315
New Code of Canon Law	645
Divine Infant: Devotion	592
Divorce: Priest assisting at re-marriage	83, 319, 558
Dominican Tertiaries: Indulgence on Feast of Our Lady of Rosary	664
Dominicans: Benedict XV and the Septenary	65
Domicile: Diocesan, is possible by New Code	362
Drum (The Rev. Walter) on Ritschlianism	438, 565
D—W's Story: In the Minds of Three	303
Easter Precept: New Law	497
Encyclical Letter on Preaching	377
Eudist Fathers at Vincennes, Indiana	230
Evasion of Reservation	677
Examination, before Permission to Preach is given	385
Existence of God: Newman's Argument from Conscience	188, 543
Exposition of Blessed Sacrament by Sisters	437
"Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus": Protestants in good faith	619
Extreme Unction: Changes in New Ritual	135
Laws of New Code	497
Question of Repeating	562
Short Form	196
Fasting and Abstinence: New Laws	542
Feminism: Some Literature suggested	435
First Friday Exercises: Votive Mass	205
Fish and Flesh allowed at same meal in Lent	542
Foreign Missions and Native Clergy	113
Franciscan Tertiaries: Blessing and Absolution within Octaves	185
Franciscans and Ancestors of Pope Benedict XV	606
Freemasonry: Its outlook for Future	184

	PAGE
Freemasonry: Its relation to the Modern World	164
State and Church	43, 164
Frèri (Monsignor) on Native Clergy for Mission Countries	113
Friars and Monks in Medieval Literature	30, 152
Funeral Mass "in die obitus"	678
Good (Barry) on Remedy for Scarcity of Priests	293
Grand Island Diocese, formerly Kearney	75
Gregory XII, Successor of Urban VI	198, 437
Hands: Anointing at Ordination	417
Harrington (Rev. J. C.): Argument from Conscience for Existence of God.	
.....	188, 543
on Luther's Faith and Reason	646
"Heart", better word than "Bowels" in Bible Texts	674
Hogan (Rev. Stanislaus) on Pope and Dominicans	65
Holy Communion: Some Changes in New Ritual	129
Holy Cross Sisters as Nurses during Civil War	233
Houck (Rev. Frederic A.) on Priest as Preacher	390
Humility of the Divine Child	594
Immaculate Conception: Representations	680
Immanence, Relative, in Catholic Theology	658
Imprimatur for Publication of Books	511
"In the Minds of Three": Apologetic Story	303
Indulgence for Ejaculation: "Mater mea, fiducia mea"	665
for Resolution to accept Death in whatsoever form	74
Indulged Prayers: Six Short ones	188
Indulgences for League of Daily Mass	535
Monthly or Weekly Confession	430
of Rosary	353
Infancy of Jesus: Devotion	592
Innocence, Protestation of, by Convicted Murderer	316
Instructions at Masses on Sundays	423
Insurance: Case of Restitution	89
Intention at Mass: Primary and Secondary	430
of Celebrant at Consecration	238, 666
Invalids receiving Holy Communion not fasting	316
Italy: Catholic Journalism there	668
James (The Rev. Edward R.) on Priest's Intention at Mass	666
Japanese Native Priests needed	123
Jollain (The Rev. J. S.) on Suárez	512
Kant, an anti-Intellectualist	438
Founder of Modern Philosophical Criticism	646
Kearney Diocese changed to Grand Island, Nebraska	75
Kerby (Dr. William J.) on Sermon and Congregation	465
Klopfer (The Rev. S.) on Confessions of Deaf-Mutes	79
Lace on Altar: Is it Proper?	91
Surplice	83
Langland and Medieval Clerics	35
Lauds at Office for the Dead	678
Layman's Reflections on Pastor's Eloquence	192
League of Daily Mass in New York	535
Lehmkuhl on the Council of Constance	198, 437
Leiturgos: Meaning of word as used by St. Paul	2
Lent: Fish and Flesh at same meal	542
Litany B. V. M.: Versicle and Prayers after same	204
in Latin on Rogation Days	84
Initial Invocations	681
Literature and Ecclesiastics in Middle Ages	30, 152
Luther and the Divinity of our Lord	438
Faith and Reason	646
MacCarthy (Dr. Joseph): New Regulations on Preaching	377
Marriage: Age of Legitimate Consent	506
Before a non-Catholic Minister	311
Case of "mixtæ religionis"	315
Legislation of New Code	497
New Laws about Impediments	374

	PAGE
Marriage: No Delegation needed for Validity	317
Priest assisting at Re-marriage after Divorce	83, 319, 558
Sanation, according to the New Code	375
Time for Solemnization	542
Martel (The Rev. Alphonsus) on Pastor's Duty toward Soldiers	420
Mason Philosophy: Dominant Drift is Theistic	43
Masonry: Its Attitude to Christianity	49, 164
Opposed to Socialism	179
Mass: Application on All Souls' Day	272
Christian Doctrine on Sunday	423
Frequency on Sunday hurts Sermon	466
Funeral Mass "in die obitus"	678
Interrupted at Offertory	429
League of Daily: Indulgences	535
"Orate Fratres" when only Women are present	314
Prayer for Bishop in Canon	679
Priest's Intention at Mass	237, 666
Primary and Secondary Intention	430
Purification of Chalice	432
Requiem: Color of Antependium	202
Saint Paul's Message	I
So-called "two-faced" and "three-faced" Masses	314
Uniformity among Congregation	434
Votive: Indult on account of Defective Sight	91
on First Fridays	205
" Mater mea, fiducia mea ": Indulged	665
Matrimony: Some Changes in New Ritual	134
McNicholas (The Very Rev. John T.) on Rosary	337
Medieval Literature and Priests and Monks	30, 152
Meehan (Monsignor) on New Code of Canon Law	357, 492
on New Ritual	129
Mental Reservation: Case of Convicted Murderer	317
Mission, Sort of Spiritual New Year's Day	471
or Day Retreat	300
Modernism, Oath against: Profession of Faith	435
Monaco, Prince of: Institute of Human Paleontology	262
Monks and Friars in Medieval Literature	30, 152
Mulleady (The Rev. B.) on Devotion to Divine Infant	592
Mural Paintings of the Cave Man	265
Murderer, Convicted: Protestation of Innocence	316
Murphy (The Rev. J. T.) on Soul's Entrance into Body	281
Native Clergy for Mission Countries	113
Newman's Argument from Conscience for Existence of God	188, 543
Non-Catholic and the Priest	618
Notre Dame University and Father Sorin, C.S.C.	225
Nuptial Blessing outside Nuptial Mass	199
Obedience: Virtue of St. Rose of Lima	633
Obermaier (Dr. Hugo): His Cave Men Studies	257, 523
O'Connor (Mr. R. F.) on Franciscans in Pope Benedict's Ancestry	606
Odd Fellows: Passive Membership	202
Offertory: Interruption of Mass thereat	429
Office for the Dead: Lauds	678
Recitation in Choir by Secular Priest	682
O'Neill (The Rev. Arthur Barry) on Priest and Non-Catholics	618
on Priest's Table	141
"Orate Fratres": Mass in Chapel of Girls' School	314
Orders, Holy: Laws of New Code	497
Ordination: Anointing of the Hands	417
Organ, equipped with Tubular Chimes, for Churches	418
Parish: Pastor's Absence needs Permission of Bishop	557
Priests: Legislation of New Code	367
Schools and Vocation to Priesthood	296
not a Burden	26
Paschal Candle: Rule for Lighting	203
Communion: New Time Limit	497, 541

	PAGE
Pastor: Absence from Parish needs Bishop's Permission	557
and Assistants at Table	144
and His School Sisters	12
and Our Soldiers	420
as a Substitute Teacher in School	25
Eloquence: Layman's Reflections	192
Penance: Laws of New Code	497
Physicians, Catholic, may not "advise" Forbidden Operation	200
Picnics: Dancing at Parish Fairs	201
Piers the Plowman: Medieval Clerics	35
Pope and Ecumenical Council	198, 437
Christmas Gift from the Clergy	684
Prague: Statue of Child Jesus	602
Prayer for Bishop in Canon of Mass	679
Preacher and Catechist: Duty of Priest	390
Sermon, Congregation	465
Preaching and Rosary Meditations	340
at Masses on Sundays	423
Layman's Reflections	192
New Regulations	377
Pride the Great Modern Evil	592
Priest and Non-Catholics	618
as Preacher and Catechist	390
Easy Victim of Professional Beggars	92
in Medieval Literature	30, 152
Intention at Mass	237, 666
Suggestions for increasing the Supply	293
Table, discussed by Father O'Neill, C.S.C.	141
Vested in Black or Violet Chasuble at Death	559
Vocations fostered by Parish Schools	296
Primates and Metropolitans: Cross	364
Profession of Faith: Oath against Modernism	435
Professional Beggars victimize Priests	92
Protestants: Attitude of Priest toward them	619
Purification of Chalice: Bination	432
Ramon y Cajal's Biological Work	266
Redemptorist Fathers on Island of St. Thomas	253
Religious: Answers about Confessors	186
Legislation in New Code	369
Re-marriage after Divorce	83, 319, 558
Reservation: Case of Evasion	677
Reserved Case: Marriage before non-Catholic Minister	311
Restitution and Bankruptcy	307
Case of Insurance Fraud	89
Retreats: Value as compared with Missions	300
Richards (The Rev. H. T. E.) on St. Paul and Mass	1
Ritschlianism: Christological Theories	438, 565
Ritual, Roman: Addition and Corrections	139
New Edition	129
Rogation Days: Litany in Latin	84
Roman Ritual: New Edition	129
Rosary Devotion explained	337
Feast of Our Lady of: Indulgence for Dominican Tertiaries	664
Sodality of the Blessed Virgin	349
Sacred Heart: Formal Object of Devotion	560
Theology of the Cultus	95
Sacristy: Confessions heard in	85
Saint Augustine and St. Jerome: Correspondence	476
Chrysostom on Romans 15: 16	9
Dominic: His Purpose in Founding His Order	67
Jerome and St. Augustine: Their Correspondence	476
Paul's Message on the Mass	1
Second Journey to Jerusalem	568
Peter and St. Paul: Difference between these Apostles	569
Rose of Lima, Patroness of America	631

	PAGE
Saint Thomas Island (Virgin Islands) purchased by United States	247
of Aquin, Pride and Glory of Order of Preachers	70
Salt, Baptismal: May it be distributed?	436
Sanctuary Lamp, What Oil to be used?	201
Scapulars as against Scapular Medals	563
Schools: Pastor's Relation thereto	12
Schwertner (The Rev. Thomas M.): St. Rose of Lima	631
Secrecy about Promotions to Bishoprics	78
Secret Society: Passive Membership	202
Seminaries in Mission Countries	117
Sermon, Preacher and Congregation	465
Sheehan, Canon: Criticism by Mr. Colclough	274
Sign of Cross: Manner of making it	85
Simplicity as an Element of Eloquence	193
Sisters: Exposition of Blessed Sacrament by Nuns	437
in our Schools: Spiritual and Physical Needs	13
Socialism and Masonry opposed	179
Society for Propagation of Faith: Native Clergy	113
Soldiers: Duty of Our Pastors	420
in Battle may receive Viaticum	83
Sorin, Father, at Notre Dame University	225
Soul is essentially an Efficient Cause	288
when does it enter the Body?	281
Spiritism: Attendance at all Séances forbidden	186
Stations of Cross: Stole worn	85
Statue, Miraculous, of Child Jesus of Prague	602
Statues on Main Altar	200
Stole or Surplice, when hearing Confessions	682
worn during Way of the Cross	85
Suárez, the Man and His Story	512
Suicide: Conditional Absolution	432
Surplice: Is Lace allowed on Altar Boy's Surplice?	83
Tabernacle Veil	90
Teachers of our Schools: Pastor's Relations	17
Thurston (The Rev. Herbert) on the Institution of Rosary	68
Time: Canonical Rules for Reckoning Time	641
Tooney (The Rev. John J.): Argument from Conscience for Existence of God	188, 549
Tourscher (The Rev. F. E.) on St. Jerome and St. Augustine	476
Trocchi, Archbishop: Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and Porto Rico	269
Tubular Chimes in Organ for Liturgical Services	418
Viaticum to Soldiers in Battle	83
Vicar General and Dean: Question of Precedence	318
Virgin Islands of the United States of America	247
Vocations to Priesthood: Suggestions for Increase	293
Walsh (Dr. James J.) on Cave Men Artists	257, 523
War and the Cave Man Research	532
Its Effect on Foreign Missions	115
Way of Cross: Stole worn during same	85
Woywod (Father Stanislaus) on New Code of Canon Law	371, 636
Writing: Useful for Priests	668

BOOK REVIEWS.

Acts of the Apostles. Story of the— Lynch:—	94
Amodo-Mullan: Life of Father Aloysius Ignatius Fiter	109
Anweiler: Chronica Fratrís Jordani a Giano	208
Ashley: Church Advertising: Its Why and How	222
Bainvel-Weidenham: Is there Salvation Outside the Catholic Church? ..	461
Barron: Mexican Problem	699
Benson-Martindale: Sermon Notes	331
Bible. The Nature and History of the— Fletcher:—	576
Blackwell: A Scallop Shell of Quiet	334
"Blessed Art Thou among Women." Butler:—	456
Blundell: Little Pilgrims to Our Lady of Lourdes	334

	PAGE
Boodin: A Realistic Universe	102
Browne: Our Renaissance	693
Burke: Chaplains' Aid Association Bulletin	588
Butler: "Blessed Art Thou among Women"	456
Calvert: A Year of Costa-Rican Natural History	458
Campbell: Various Discourses	691
Canon Sheehan of Doneraile. Heuser:—	581
Catholic's Work in the World. Husslein:—	687
Centenary of the Society of Mary. Garvin:—	452
Charities. Fourth Biennial Meeting of the National Conference of Catholic—	96
Charity—Sisters of—of Nazareth, Kentucky. McGill:—	211
Chronica Fratris Jordani a Giano. Anweiler:—	208
Church and Science. Windle:—	321
Churchmen—Catholic—in Science. Walsh:	692
Clark: The Rest House	110
Coakley: Inside Facts about the Catholic Church	589
Codex of Canon Law	273, 357, 371, 492, 541
Colbrith: Poems of Charles Warren Stoddard	333
Communion. A Companion for Daily—	221
Costa-Rican Natural History. A Year of— Calvert:—	458
Cronin: The Science of Ethics	576
D'Alton: Horace and His Age	694
Dease. Life and Letters of Mother Teresa—	221
Delloue-Leahy: Solution of Great Problem	323
Democracy. The Next Step in— Sellars:—	97
Denifle: Luther and Lutherdom	689
Discourses. Various— Campbell:—	691
Dogmas. Manual of the History of— Otten:—	450
Donovan: An Unwilling Traveler	335
Duffy: An Archbishop's Inheritance	589
Durward: Poems of B. I. Durward	105
Ebb and Flow of Life. Kümmel:—	457
Encyclopedia—Catholic—and its Makers	585
Eschatology. Pohle-Preuss:—	206
Ethics. The Science of— Cronin:—	576
Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony. Pohle-Preuss:—	206
Fairest Argument. Noll:—	207
Farrell: An Introduction to Political Philosophy	455
Fillebrown: Principles of Natural Taxation	218
Fletcher: Nature and History of the Bible	576
Garvin: The Centenary of the Society of Mary	452
Giran-Rothwell: A Modern Job	463
Grisar-Lamond: Luther	324
Henderson: The Order of Nature	100
Heuser: Canon Sheehan of Doneraile	581
Hoagland: Collective Bargaining in the Lithographic Industry	221
Holy Hour of Gethsemane. Donnelly:—	108
Horace and His Age. D'Alton:—	694
Husslein: The Catholic's Work in the World	687
Kaulakis: A Plea for the Lithuanians	335
Koch: Moral Theology	590
Kümmel: The Ebb and Flow of Life	457
Lasance: Manna of the Soul	590
Laws of Physical Science. Northrup:—	698
Leaves of God	335
Lucas: God's Truth	222
Luismet: The Mystical Knowledge of God	334
Lummis: The Spanish Pioneers	461
Luther and Lutherdom. Denifle-Volz:—	689
Luther. Grisar-Lamond:—	324
Lynch: Story of the Acts of the Apostles	94
Lynk: Music of Life and other Allegories	590
MacEachen: Moral Series	451
Maher: While Shepherds Watched	699
Manual of the Children of Mary	222

441 19

	PAGE
McDonough: Verses of Thirty Years Ago	221
McGill: The Sisters of Charity of Nazareth, Kentucky	211
McKenna, O.P., P.G., Very Rev. Charles H.— O'Daniel:—	686
McNeiry: Thursdays with the Blessed Sacrament	590
Meehan: Thomas Maurice Mulry	332
Mercier: Per Crucem ad Lucem	334
Moral Series. MacEachen:—	451
Mother Pauline Von Mallinckrodt. Life of—	453
Mullan: Sodality Book	222
Mulry. Thomas Maurice— Meehan:—	332
Noll: The Fairest Argument	207
Northrup: Laws of Physical Science	698
Nyburg: The Chosen People	110
O'Byrne: Thundher an' Turf	588
O'Daniel: The Very Rev. Charles H. McKenna, O.P., P.G.	686
Order of Nature. Henderson:—	100
Otten: Manual of the History of Dogmas	450
Pallen: A Memorial of Andrew J. Shipman	209
Papi: Religious Profession	589
Paynell-Erasmus: Complaint of Peace	220
Pearce: The Monks of Westminster	588
Pennsylvania. The Commonwealth of— Smith:—	697
Petrovitz: Theology of the Cultus of the Sacred Heart	95
Philosophy—Political—An Introduction to— Farrell:—	455
Philosophy. The Essentials of— Sellars:—	586
Poems of B. I. Durward	105
Pohle-Preuss: Eschatology	206
Pohle-Preuss: Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony	206
Politics. Von Treitschke-Dugdale-DeBille:—	212
Poulin: Sources of Living Water	108
Realistic Universe. Boodin:—	102
Renaissance. Our— Browne:—	693
Rickaby: Authority and Religious Belief	590
Roman Ritual	129
Rothensteiner: Chronicles of an Old Missouri Parish	589
Ryan: Christopher Columbus in Poetry, History and Art	333
Sacred Heart. Theology of the Cultus of the— Petrovitz:—	95
Sadlier: Life of Mlle. le Gras (Louise de Marillac)	335
Sadlier: Names that Live in Catholic Hearts	220
St. Optatus—Work of—Against the Donatists. Vassall-Phillips:—	584
St. Thomas Aquinas. Summa Theologica of—	330
Sellars: The Essentials of Philosophy	586
Sellars: The Next Step in Democracy	97
Sermon Notes. Benson—Martindale:—	331
Sheehan—Canon—of Doneraile. Heuser:—	581
Shipman. A Memorial of Andrew J.— Pallen:—	209
Smith. The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania	697
Solution of Great Problem. Delloue—Leahy:—	323
Sponsa Christi	109
Strappini: The Inward Gospel	108
Taxation. Principles of Natural— Fillebrown:—	218
Theologica—Summa—of St. Thomas Aquinas	330
Theology of the Cultus of the Sacred Heart. Petrovitz:—	95
Thrift	590
Van Loo: Kantisme et Modernisme	109
Vassall-Phillips: The Work of St. Optatus against the Donatists	584
Von Mallinckrodt. Life of Mother Mary Pauline—	453
Von Treitschke-Dugdale-DeBille: Politics	212
Waggaman: Grapes of Thorns	110
Walsh-Boulger: "Don'ts"	222
Walsh: Catholic Churchmen in Science	692
Walsh: The Guileless Saxon	110
War: Books on the—	334, 335, 588
Windle: The Church and Science	321



BX 801 .A3 SMC

The American
ecclesiastical review.
AIP-1595 (awab)

Does Not Circulate

